DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 738 HE 026 394

AUTHOR	Davis, Jerry S.; And Others
TITLE	State Funded Scholarship/Grant Programs for Students To Attend Postsecondary Educational Institutions. 24th Annual Survey Report 1992-93 Academic Year.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs.; Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE	Mar 93
NOTE	186p.; For the 1991-92 report, see ED 343 496.
AVAILABLE FROM	Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, 660 Boas Street, Towne House, Harrisburg, PA 17102-1398 ($5).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; Black Students; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Eligibility; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; Low Income Groups; Need Analysis (Student Financial Aid); Postsecondary Education; Private Colleges; Public Colleges; *Scholarships; State Agencies; *State Aid; *State Programs; Statistical Data; *Student Financial Aid; Surveys; Trend Analysis; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS	*National Assn of State Scholarship Grant Programs

ABSTRACT

The annual survey of members of the National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs (NASSGP) collected data on state and territory funded scholarships and grants awarded to undergraduate and graduate students. The following are among the conclusions resulting from the survey: (1) states expect to award over $2.57 billion in total grant aid to over 1.7 million postsecondary students in the 1992-93 fiscal year, representing a expected growth rate of about 8 percent over last year; (2) the non-need-grant aid to undergraduates is expected to grow by about 9.7 percent, from $194 million to $212 million, in the 31 states that offer such grants; (3) only 12 states have increased their need-based grant dollars awarded in each year since 1987-88, while only 10 states have experienced substantial and consistent growth with grant dollars awarded growing at a faster rate than college costs; and (4) on average, states spend about $7.32 per resident for all grant programs, about $70 per college-age resident, and about $237 per full-time undergraduate student. Data analyses consist of a narrative followed by extensive tables presenting data on: comparative program statistics, 1992-93, 1991-92; program changes, policy issues, and related matters; 5-year trends in need-based undergraduate grant dollar expenditures by states; and rankings of state grant program expenditures. A listing of NASSGP officers and a directory of state grant agencies are appended. (GLR)

NASSGP

ED356738

24th

National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs

Annual Survey Report 1992-1993 Academic Year

HE026394

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Pennsylvania H. E. Assistance Agency

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GENERAL INFORMATION

Founded on October 26, 1966, the National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs is an association of states with general programs of scholarship or grant assistance for postsecondary students. Executive officers responsible for grant program administration represent each state in the Association. Section VI of this report contains a list of Association officers, past president, and members.

To receive single copies of this report and/or copies of the 20th, 21st, 22nd, and 23rd reports, send a $5.00 check for each copy, made payable to the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, at 660 Boas Street, Towne House, Harrisburg, PA 17102-1398, Attention: Research and Policy Analysis.

Copies of survey reports for several years are available through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Document Reproduction Service/Computer Microfilm Corporation, 3900 Wheeler Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22304.

Copies available include:

7th Annual Survey, 1975-76	ED 122661
8th Annual Survey, 1976-77	ED 130590
10th Annual Survey, 1978-79	HE 011042
11th Annual Survey, 1979-80	ED 179445
12th Annual Survey, 1980-81	ED 206238
13th Annual Survey, 1981-82	ED 253171
14th Annual Survey, 1982-83	ED 265820
15th Annual Survey, 1983-84	ED 253172
16th Annual Survey, 1984-85	ED 253173
17th Annual Survey, 1985-86	ED 265821
18th Annual Survey, 1986-87	ED 021503
19th Annual Survey, 1987-88	ED 296640
20th Annual Survey, 1988-89	ED 305854
22nd Annual Survey, 1990-91	ED 329176
23rd Annual Survey, 1991-92	ED 343496

Permission to reproduce and distribute any part of the 24th Annual Survey Report is hereby given.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The National Association of State Scholarship & Grant Programs

NASSGP

24th Annual Survey Report
1992-93 Academic Year

State Funded Scholarship/Grant Programs for
Students to Attend
Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Prepared by:

Jerry S. Davis
Vice President
Research and Policy Analysis

Deborah Nastelli
Statistical Analyst I

Kenneth E. Redd
Research Associate

Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency
March 1993

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

PHEAA is pleased to provide this 24th Annual Survey Report to NASSGP, its members, and the financial aid community. We are proud to have been able to serve the Association by conducting the Survey, for the thirteenth consecutive year, compiling the results, and making them available to policymakers nationwide.

The annual collection, analysis, and reporting of the data are tasks that require much time and effort for many persons. I want to acknowledge their contributions here.

PHEAA and NASSGP are indebted to the state grant agency staff who annually furnish voluminous amounts of data in responding to the Survey. Preparing this report would be impossible without their cooperation and support. We very much appreciate their assistance.

The PHEAA Research and Policy Analysis staff devotes much effort to compiling the Survey data, verifying them with individual states and preparing the Report. The contributions of PHEAA staff, in addition to the three persons listed as authors of the Report, should be recognized. Miriam Cooper, administrative assistant to the R & PA division, distributed the surveys, collected the responses, and helped compile the data. Michelle Kinard, assistant for research, assisted in the preparation of several tables for reproduction. Cheryl Rudy of PHEAA's Word Processing Center typed and edited the Report.

I want also to thank the members of the nation's financial aid community, whose continued interest in and use of the NASSGP Reports rewards our Agency's efforts in behalf of the Association.

Jay W. Evans
President and Chief
Executive Officer
Pennsylvania Higher Education
Assistance Agency

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
SECTION I	- SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS	1
SECTION II	- COMPARATIVE PROGRAM STATISTICS, 1992-93, 1991-92, AND EARLIER YEARS	4
SECTION III	- PROGRAM CHANGES, POLICY ISSUES, AND RELATED MATTERS	20
SECTION IV	- FIVE-YEAR TRENDS IN NEED-BASED UNDERGRADUATE GRANT DOLLAR EXPENDITURES BY STATES	26
SECTION V	- RANKINGS OF STATE GRANT PROGRAM EXPENDITURES	31
SECTION VI	- TABLES	39

Table

1	Estimated Total Grant Aid Awarded by State Programs, 1992-93, by Types of Programs	40
2	Dollars and Number of Awards for Comprehensive Undergraduate Competitive and Non-Competitive State Scholarship and Grant Programs Based on Need, Actual 1991-92 and Estimated for 1992-93	41
3	Dollars and Number of Awards for Comprehensive Need-Based Grant Programs for Graduate/Professional School Students, Actual 1991-92 and Estimated 1992-93	47
4	Dollars and Number of Awards for Non-Need-Based Grant Programs for Undergraduate Students, Actual 1991-92 and Estimated 1992-93	49
5	Dollars and Number of Awards for Non-Need-Based Grant Programs for Graduate/Professional School Students, Actual 1991-92 and Estimated 1992-93	54
6	Other Programs Administered by the State Agency	57
7	State-Funded Student Aid Programs Administered by State Agencies Other than the Responding Agency	65
8	State Student Incentive Grant Program Activities by States	69
9	Selected Program Characteristics, 1992-93	70
10	Eligible Institutions	81
11	Comments to Help Survey Readers to Better Understand Agency Situations	91
12	Comments Regarding Significant Changes in Current Programs or Operations Planned for 1992-93	95
13	Comments Regarding New Student Aid Programs and Practices for 1993-94 or 1994-95	99
14	Agency Comments on the Effect of the Recession on Grant Programs' Costs and Number of Applicants	101
15	Comments Regarding Agency's Efforts to Alleviate the Negative Effects of Tuition Increases	105

Page

Table

16 Comments Regarding the Effects of Changes in Agency Grant Programs on College Enrollments..... 108
17 Agency Comments on the Potential Effects of the New Federal Need Analysis Rules on the Number and Amount of Grant Awards..... 109
18 States With Appropriations to Institutions Specifically for Financial Aid Award Purposes..... 114
19 Aggregate Dollars of Awards for Undergraduate Need-Based Grant Programs, by States, Grouped by Award Dollar Volumes, 1987-88 to 1992-93..... 115
20 Net Dollar Changes in Undergraduate Need-Based Grant Awards and Average Annual Combined Grant Awards by States, 1988-89 to 1990-91 and 1990-91 to 1992-93..... 118
21 Estimated Grant Dollars Per Resident Population..... 121
22 Estimated Grant Dollars Per Resident College-Age Population, 1992-93, by States..... 122
23 Estimated Grant Dollars to Undergraduates in 1992-93 Per Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment, by States..... 123
24 States Ranked by Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduates Receiving Grant Awards..... 124
25 Total State Grants as a Percentage of Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education in 1992-93..... 125

SECTION VII - NASSGP OFFICERS AND DIRECTORY..... 127

SECTION I

SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS

In 1992-93, states expect to award over $2.57 billion in total grant aid to over 1,700,000 postsecondary students, representing an expected growth rate of about 8 percent over last year's dollars awarded. This year, as in previous years, about 75 percent of the aid will be in need-based grants to undergraduates and 80 percent will be awarded by the 14 states that each expect to award more than $50 million.

For the fourth consecutive year, states will collectively award more than $1.5 billion in need-based grants to undergraduates. They expect to award $1.944 billion, about 8.1 percent more than last year's $1.798 billion. The median expected growth rate for all 50 states and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico is 7.1 percent and 22 states expect to increase their need-based grant award dollars by at least 10 percent. This grown is, in part, to help make up for last year's suppressed growth when only 12 states experienced 10 percent increases, 17 states experienced no growth and/or losses, and the median growth rate for all states was just 3.8 percent. This year's expected growth rate is the highest since between 1988-89 and 1989-90, when the median growth rate was 7.5 percent and states increased their combined dollars by 8.1 percent.

Although the patterns of expected growth for 1992-93 generally are good, the growth patterns for the past five years are not as positive. Only 12 states have increased their need-based grant dollars awarded in <u>each</u> year since 1987-88: Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Washington, and West Virginia.

Moreover, when the growth patterns of the 1988-89 to 1990-91 and 1990-91 to 1992-93 years were compared, it was discovered that only ten states had experienced "substantial and consistent" growth, i.e., their net changes in amounts awarded were greater in the second time period <u>and</u> their award dollars grew at a faster rate than college costs. These states are: Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania. Sixteen states have seen their net changes in awards decrease and their amounts awarded have not kept pace with cost increases. Another eight states have experienced slowed growth in their awards. Therefore, the longer-term growth patterns are not very positive, even though this year's growth patterns generally look good.

This year non-need-based grant aid to undergraduates is expected to grow by about 9.7 percent, from $194 million to $212.9 million, in the 31 states that offer such grants. During the past five years, and in <u>any</u> five-year period since the inception of the NASSGP Reports, non-need-based grant dollars have grown at a higher rate than need-based ones. However, 90 percent of the grant dollars states award to undergraduates still are need-based and about 59 percent of all state grant programs require recipients to demonstrate financial need.

The expected changes in award dollars for the three types of non-need-based grant aid are: for "tuition equalization" programs, 9.1 percent; for merit scholarships, 7.0 percent; and for "categorical aid" programs, 20.1 percent. That award levels for "categorical aid" programs are expected to increase at a higher

rate than other types of non-need-based or need-based grants suggests that it may be easier for states, during periods of fiscal difficulties, to secure program funding for special categories of students than for students in general.

Although all states offer grant programs to assist undergraduates, only 30 states offer programs for graduate and/or professional school students. Eight states offer need-based and non-need-based grants to graduate/professional school students: Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Maryland, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, and Oklahoma. Another 13 states offer only need-based grants and just eight offer only non-need-based grants.

The 21 states with non-need-based grant programs expect to award $27,435,000 to 22,861 students in 1992-93, about 7.9 percent more than they awarded to basically the same number of students in 1991-92. However, the states expect to award 13.4 percent fewer dollars this year than five years ago, in 1987-88. So there generally is a downward trend in need-based grant dollars awarded to graduate/professional school students.

The 17 states with non-need-based grant programs for graduate/professional school students expect to award $12,716,000 to 4,382 students this year, representing a 3 percent increase in dollars and a 5 percent increase in awards over 1991-92. Five of the 17 states, Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Mississippi, and New Jersey, each expect to award fewer dollars this year than last. The dollar amounts awarded have held study for the past three years and have increased by just 38 percent since 1987-88.

Each year the NASSGP Survey collects estimates for need-based and non-need-based grant dollars awarded to undergraduates and post-baccalaureate students, while asking respondents to list the actual amounts they awarded in each category for the preceding year. Actual amounts are not collected for programs identified as "Other Aid" in Table 1, because these programs are not considered "basic" ones by the Survey and the programs respondents describe frequently vary from one year to the next.

When the expected amounts in the four basic categories for 1992-93 were compared to the actual amounts for 1991-92, it was found that this year's total dollars should increase by about 8.2 percent, from $2.030 billion to $2.197 billion. Only four states, Alaska, California, Iowa, and Michigan, expect to award fewer combined dollars in 1992-93 than they awarded in 1991-92. Sixteen states awarded fewer combined dollars in 1991-92 than in 1990-91. This is further evidence that 1992-93 is generally expected to be a better year of growth than was 1991-92.

This year nine states expect to increase their combined dollars awarded by more than 20 percent over last year's dollars. The states are, listed from highest to lowest percentage rate increase: Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Louisiana, North Dakota, Arkansas, Puerto Rico, Georgia, Maryland, and Kentucky. Georgia, Massachusetts, and Puerto Rico awarded fewer combined dollars in 1991-92 than in 1990-91, so this year's increases could be considered making up for last year's losses. Because many states expect to increase their award dollars this year to help make up for last year's losses, only nine states expect to award fewer dollars in 1992-93 than they awarded in 1990-91. However, only 17 of the 43 states expected to award more dollars this year than in 1990-91 expect increases

than should keep pace with increases in college costs. Therefore, in all, just half the states expect two-year increases in combined grant dollars to keep pace with costs.

About 59 percent of the grant program are need-based and about 30 percent require demonstration of "merit" to receive either need-based or non-need-based awards. Since 1987-88, the number of need-based grant programs has grown by 20 percent while the number of non-need-based programs has grown by only 6 percent. Since 1987-88, the number of merit-based programs has declined by 7 percent. This latter fact, coupled with the finding that award dollars spent for non-need-based merit scholarships for undergraduates have increased by just 11 percent since 1990-91, suggests that the movement in the early and middle 1980s toward merit-based scholarship programs has slowed considerably.

On the average, states spend about $7.32 per resident for all grant programs, about $70 per "college-age" resident, and about $237 per full-time undergraduate student. About one out of every four full-time undergraduates receives a state grant of some kind. Only 13 states spend more than $10 per resident, 10 states spend more than $100 per "college-age" resident, and just eight states spend more than $400 per full-time undergraduate. Just eight states award grants to more than one-third of their full-time undergraduates.

Compared to what they appropriate for higher education operating expenses, states generally spend little on their grant programs. Aggregate state grant amounts represent only 6.5 percent of total appropriations for operating expenses, with 16 states' grant amounts representing under 2 percent of their appropriations and only six states spending at least 10 percent: New York, Vermont, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Iowa.

However, state grant programs fared better than appropriations to higher education in most states this year. Expenditures on grants of all types, including "Other Aid" as displayed in Table 1, are expected to increase in 48 states while appropriations will increase in just 26 states. Total state spending for grants increased in 25 of the 26 states where appropriations increased but total grant amounts fell in only one of the 24 states where appropriations decreased or remained constant. In 22 states, grant expenditures increased while appropriations decreased. Overall, combined appropriations for higher education operating expenses increased by just 1 percent while state spending on grants increased by 8 percent. Thus it appears that states were more willing this year to increase grant expenditures than appropriations to higher education.

Only three programs were identified as new ones for 1992-93. They include two need-based grant programs for undergraduates, Delaware's Governor's Workforce Development Grant program and Massachusetts' Cash Grants program; and a non-need-based, merit-based scholarship program for undergraduates, Louisiana's Honors Scholarship program. These three programs' combined award dollars, $11.86 million, should represent about 0.5 percent of all combined need-based and non-need-based grant dollars awarded by states to undergraduates in 1992-93 and about 7.2 percent of the expected increase in grant dollars from 1991-92 to 1992-93.

The Survey revealed that states are concerned with the effects of changes in the federal student aid programs on their financial aid delivery systems and assessment of applicant need, with trying to keep pace with increases in the demand for aid, and with making their programs operate more efficiently.

The Report is presented in the format first tried last year, in which all tables are displayed in Section VI after the text for the first five sections. The final section of the Report, Section VII, provides the names and addresses of the state grant agencies and their officials.

SECTION II

COMPARATIVE PROGRAM STATISTICS
1992-93, 1991-92, AND EARLIER YEARS

In 1992-93, states expect to award over $2.5 billion in grant aid to postsecondary education students (see Table 1). This is the fourth year the total has exceeded $2 billion after first exceeding $1 billion in 1981-82. The data were collected for need-based and non-need-based grant programs for undergraduate and graduate students that are administered by state grant agencies and for grant programs administered by other state agencies or colleges acting in behalf of state agencies. [1]

As in years past, about three-fourths of this year's state grant dollars (75.6 percent) will be awarded through need-based programs for undergraduates. Another 8.3 percent will be in non-need-based grants to undergraduates. Just 1.5 percent of the dollars will be awarded through state agencies in need-based and non-need-based grants to graduate and professional school students. The remaining 14.6 percent will be awarded through a variety of other state-supported programs.

The 26 states that each expect to award at least $20 million expect to award a combined $2.416 billion, about 94 percent of the total dollars. The six states each expected to award at least $100 million will combine to award $1.474 billion, about 57 percent of the total. They are, in rank order: New York, California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Texas, and New Jersey. Another eight states that each expect to award at least $50 million should award a combined $587 million, about 23 percent of the total. These states are, in rank order: Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, Florida, North Carolina, Iowa, Indiana, and Massachusetts. So just 14 states expect to award about 80 percent of all the grant dollars.

The 12 remaining states each expected to award at least $20 million are: Wisconsin, Oklahoma, Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Virginia, Colorado, Georgia, Puerto Rico, Washington, Tennessee, and Missouri. They should award a combined $355 million, about 14 percent of the total.

Only seven other states each expect to award at least $10 million in 1992-93: South Carolina, New Mexico, West Virginia, Alabama, Oregon, Utah, and Vermont. Their combined awards should total about $99.8 million. The remaining 19 states are expected to award a combined $56 million.

It is clear that this year, as in previous years, the state grant dollars will be concentrated in a small portion of the states.

Undergraduate Need-Based Grant Aid

As was noted above, three-fourths of all the state grant aid goes to undergraduates through need-based grant and scholarship programs. This is the fourth consecutive year that need-based grant dollars will have exceeded $1.5 billion. The expected dollar amount for 1992-93, $1.944 billion, represents 8.1

[1] For purposes of brevity, "states" is used throughout this report to refer to the 50 states as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

percent more than the $1.798 billion awarded in 1991-92 (see Table 2). The total dollars for the preceding five years were: for 1990-91, $1.675 billion; for 1989-90, $1.556 billion; for 1988-89, $1.440 billion; for 1987-88, $1.392 billion; and for 1986-87, $1.338 billion.

Here is how this year's expected 8.1 percent growth rate compares to the actual growth rates for previous years:

1980 to 1981	6.3 percent	1986 to 1987	4.0 percent
1981 to 1982	7.8 percent	1987 to 1988	3.4 percent
1982 to 1983	8.1 percent	1988 to 1989	8.1 percent
1983 to 1984	11.4 percent	1989 to 1990	7.5 percent
1984 to 1985	7.0 percent	1990 to 1991	7.3 percent
1985 to 1986	8.4 percent		

The average annual growth rate in combined dollars for the past 11 years was 7.2 percent. This year's expected growth rate, if it is achieved, will be higher than all but two years' growth rates since 1980, and it will be the highest since 1988 to 1989. Even more important is the fact that this year's 8.1 percent expected growth rate will, if it is achieved, reverse a downward trend in annual growth rates observed after 1989-90.

Because so many of the dollars are awarded by a small number of states, major changes in the dollars awarded by just a few states can have a dramatic effect on changes in combined dollar amounts. For example, if the combined expected growth rate for programs in New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania was 8 percent rather than the expected 10 percent, then the expected growth rate for all combined grant dollars would be 7.2 percent rather than 8.1 percent. Therefore, a more accurate picture of annual growth rate patterns for all states is revealed when the frequency distributions of year-to-year percentage rate changes are examined. The data for 1987 through 1992 are as follows:

Annual Percentage Change	Actual 1987 to 1988	Actual 1988 to 1989	Actual 1989 to 1990	Actual 1990 to 1991	Expected 1991 to 1992
Increase 20 Percent Plus	6	8	7	3	11
Increase 15 to 19 Percent	1	7	2	4	4
Increase 10 to 14 Percent	3	7	5	5	7
Increase 5 to 9 Percent	11	8	8	10	7
Increase 1 to 4 Percent	12	3	6	13	14
Under 1 Percent Change	5	9	3	5	4
Decrease 1 to 4 Percent	11	5	7	2	4
Decrease 5 to 9 Percent	1	2	8	3	0
Decrease 10 Percent Plus	2	3	6	7	1
All States	52	52	52	52	52
Median Rate	3.3%	7.5%	2.3%	3.8%	7.1%

It is clear from these distributions that 1992-93 should be an exceptional year of fairly high growth rates for need-based grant aid for many states. This year 22 states expect to increase their grant dollars awarded by at least 10 percent. Between 1988 and 1989 was the last time as many states experienced this level of growth.

This year 11 states expect to increase their grant award dollars by more than 20 percent over what they awarded in 1991-92. However, four of those states experienced losses of grant dollars between 1990-91 and 1991-92. Therefore, in effect, this year they are making up for last year's losses. Here are this year's states that expect greater than 20 percent growth rates, along with their 1990-91 to 1991-92 growth rates:

	1991-92 to 1992-93	1990-91 to 1991-92
Massachusetts	+94.1 percent	-48.5 percent
New Hampshire	+51.9 percent	+ 7.1 percent
North Dakota	+46.6 percent	+25.3 percent
Virginia	+36.0 percent	-33.4 percent
Arkansas	+33.3 percent	+22.1 percent
Maryland	+28.1 percent	+ 4.1 percent
Delaware	+23.7 percent	-15.9 percent
South Dakota	+22.3 percent	+ 2.6 percent
Kentucky	+20.7 percent	-14.4 percent
Idaho	+20.1 percent	+38.0 percent

Only North Dakota, Arkansas, and Idaho clearly and substantially increased their grant dollars over the two-year period. And Arkansas and North Dakota lost dollars between 1989-90 and 1990-91.

Here are the comparisons for the four states that this year expect to increase their grant dollars by between 15 and 19 percent:

	1991-92 to 1992-93	1990-91 to 1991-92
Colorado	+19.6 percent	+ 9.8 percent
New Jersey	+18.6 percent	-13.1 percent
Louisiana	+15.3 percent	+16.1 percent
Ohio	+15.2 percent	+ 4.9 percent

New Jersey expects to increase its award dollars by 18.6 percent after experiencing a 13.1 percent loss between 1990-91 and 1991-92. The other three states should experience growth in both years.

Even though some states' increases are compensating for earlier years' losses, this year appears to be a good year for growth in need-based grant awards to undergraduates.

The number of recipients is expected to be 1,506,506, up by about 5.9 percent over last year's 1,422,355. This year only 11 states expect to award need-based grants to fewer undergraduates than they did in 1991-92: Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii,

Nebraska, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia. Only Hawaii and Washington expect to cut their numbers of recipients by more than 10 percent. And of these 11 states, only Georgia expects to award fewer dollars to fewer recipients.

The average grant award is expected to grow by 2 percent, from $1,264 to $1,290. Here are the numbers of recipients and average awards for this year and the preceding five years:

	Recipients	Average Award
1992-93	1,506,506	$1,290
1991-92	1,422,355	$1,264
1990-91	1,397,811	$1,197
1989-90	1,340,637	$1,161
1988-89	1,318,685	$1,092
1987-88	1,303,369	$1,068

Since 1987-88, the number of recipients has grown by 15.6 percent while the average grant has grown by 20.8 percent. Combined award dollars have grown by about 39.6 percent. These data suggest that states generally have increased their average awards to try to keep pace with the growth in costs rather than increase the number of students assisted.

Graduate Need-Based Grant Aid

Although all states have need-based grant aid for their undergraduates, only 21 states reported having such programs for their graduate and/or professional school students (see Table 3). The combined dollars awarded from these programs are expected to grow by 7.9 percent, to $27,435,000. Little change is expected in the number of recipients, from 22,671 last year to 22,861 in 1992-93. When compared to changes in awards to undergraduates, the awards to graduate/professional school students are slight. Here are the data for 1992-93 and the preceding five years:

	Recipients	Dollars
1992-93	22,861	$27,425,000
1991-92	22,671	$25,420,000
1990-91	25,174	$28,118,000
1989-90	26,011	$28,882,000
1988-89	26,432	$31,503,000
1987-88	31,198	$31,661,000

These data suggest that there is a downward trend in the numbers and amounts of need-based awards to graduate/professional school students. Only nine states expect to award at least $1 million in grants this year. They are: New York, $9.97 million; Michigan, $3.22 million; Texas, $2.82 million; Puerto Rico, $2.32 million; California, $2.27 million; Oklahoma, $1.63 million; New Jersey, $1.45 million; North Carolina, $1.16 million; and Colorado, $1.01 million.

Non-Need-Based Undergraduate Grant Aid

This year 31 states identified non-need-based grant aid programs for undergraduate students (see Table 4). The states expect to award $212,872,000 to 204,969 students, representing a 9.7 percent increase in dollars and a 1.0 percent increase in students. During the past five years, and in any five-year period since the inception of NASSGP reports, non-need-based grant dollars grew at a faster rate than need-based grant dollars. Nevertheless, 90 percent of the grant dollars states award to undergraduates are need-based.

Here are the numbers of recipients and dollars for this year and the preceding five years:

	Recipients	Dollars
1992-93	204,969	$212,872,000
1991-92	202,860	$194,034,000
1990-91	246,072	$202,765,000
1989-90	234,319	$190,660,000
1988-89	222,828	$170,879,000
1987-88	215,936	$145,377,000

The substantial drop in numbers of recipients between 1990-91 and 1991-92 occurred because the New York Regents College Scholarship program made no awards after 1990-91, when it assisted 52,576 students.

This and previous NASSGP reports have found it meaningful to group the non-need-based grant programs into three categories: (1) "tuition equalization programs," to help reduce differences between tuition costs at private and public colleges; (2) "scholarship programs," to give meritorious students incentives to attend in-state institutions; and (3) "categorical aid programs," to encourage participation in particular study areas, such as mathematics or science, or programs that aid dependents of special constituents, such as veterans or policemen.

Tuition equalization programs generally award the largest combined dollar amounts of the three categories of programs. The six states with these programs are: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Ohio, and Virginia. This year they expect to award $100,770,000, about 9.1 percent more than they awarded last year, but only 2.2 percent more than they awarded in 1990-91 (see Table 4). Alabama, Florida, and North Carolina expect to award fewer dollars this year than in 1990-91, but Alabama's expected award dollars are up from last year's amount. Since 1987-88, the combined tuition equalization grant dollars awarded by these six states have grown by only 22.2 percent.

This year 22 states expect to award $81,046,000 in merit scholarships, representing a 7.1 percent increase over last year's combined total (see Table 4). Illinois, Indiana, New York, and North Dakota expect to spend fewer scholarship dollars this year than last. New Mexico and Rhode Island reported no merit scholarships after having them in 1991-92.

The largest expected increase is for Louisiana, whose new Honors Scholarship program should award $1,839,000 to $1,021 students. Just two states' award dollars account for over 43 percent of the total. Florida expects to award $25,017,000 (30.9 percent) and Missouri expects to award $10,250,000 (12.6

percent). Colorado expects to award $8,970,000 and New Jersey expects to award $8,362,000. Therefore, four states are expected to award 65 percent of the merit scholarship dollars awarded by all states.

During the five-year period between 1987-88 and 1992-93, combined merit scholarship dollars are expected to grow by 88 percent, from $43.1 million to $81.0 million. However, 77 percent of that growth should occur in just two states, Florida and Missouri. Between 1987-88 and 1992-93, Florida's dollars grew from $4,084,000 to $25,017,000 and Missouri's grew from $1,811,000 to $10,250,000. So the expected five-year growth rate in combined dollars from all other states' programs is just 23 percent, from $37.2 million to about $45.8 million.

In 1992-93, 41 categorical aid programs in 20 states are expected to award a combined $31,076,000, about 19.8 percent more than the $25,950,000 awarded in 1991-92 (see Table 4). However, 98 percent of the growth in grant dollars is expected to come from the programs in just three states, Florida, Illinois, and New York. So the growth rate in combined categorical aid dollars in the other 17 states is under 2 percent. Five states, Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, expect to award fewer categorical aid dollars this year than last. And the aid programs in just Florida, Illinois, and New York are expected to award 81 percent of all this year's dollars in this category. Clearly the categorical aid dollars for undergraduates are concentrated in just a few states. So is the growth.

Between 1987-88 and 1992-93, categorical aid dollars should grow by about 57 percent, from $19.8 million to the expected $31.1 million. But virtually all that growth will have occurred in the programs of just Florida and Illinois. These two states' combined categorical grant aid is expected to increase by $13.8 million during the five-year period. Categorical grant aid dollars in the other 18 states are expected to shrink by about 16.2 percent during the five-year period.

Categorical aid programs generally are small ones. The largest single programs are Illinois' Veteran Grants program, $10,800,000; New York's Vietnam Veterans Tuition Awards program, $3,000,000; and Ohio's War Orphans Scholarship program, $2,659,000. The remaining 38 programs' average award level is only $385,000, with 18 expecting to award under $100,000 this year.

Here are the combined millions of dollars of awards for the three types of non-need-based grant aid for 1987-88, 1991-92, and 1992-93:

	1987-88	Pct	1991-92	Pct	1992-93	Pct
Tuition Equalization	$ 82.5	56.7%	$ 92.4	47.6%	$100.8	47.4%
Merit Scholarships	43.1	29.7	75.7	39.0	81.0	38.0
Categorical Aid	19.8	13.6	25.9	13.4	31.1	14.6
Non-Need-Based	$145.4	100.0%	$194.0	100.0%	$212.9	100.0%

Since 1987-88, total non-need-based grant aid to undergraduates should grow by about 47 percent. The greatest growth rate is for merit scholarships, which should grow by 88 percent. The next highest growth rate is for categorical aid programs, 57 percent; with tuition equalization program award dollars growing at just 22 percent.

Non-Need-Based Graduate/Professional School Student Grants

Just 17 states have non-need-based grant programs for graduate and professional school students (see Table 5). The 32 programs in these states expect to award $12,716,000 this year, only 3.0 percent more than they awarded in 1991-92. Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Mississippi, and New Jersey each expect to award fewer dollars this year than last.

Only five states, Alaska, Colorado, Illinois, New York, and Virginia, are each expected to award more than $1 million to graduate/professional school students. New York's $4,156,000 represents 32.7 percent of the combined grant dollars.

Just 12 of the 32 programs are merit scholarship programs and they are expected to award a combined $6,298,000. Virginia's program is a tuition equalization program that expects to award $1,304,000. The remaining 19 programs are categorical aid programs, expected to award $5,114,000.

Here are the annual numbers of non-need-based graduate/professional school recipients and dollars received for this year and the preceding five years:

	Recipients	Dollars
1992-93	4,382	$12,716,000
1991-92	4,154	$12,349,000
1990-91	3,445	$12,763,000
1989-90	4,330	$14,812,000
1988-89	3,426	$10,881,000
1987-88	3,057	$ 9,226,000

Although the annual number of awards seems to be increasing, the dollar amounts have held steady for the past three years.

States are more likely to award non-need-based grant aid to graduate/professional school students than to undergraduates. Only 10 percent of the state grant aid to undergraduates, but 32 percent of the grant aid to post-baccalaureate students, is non-need-based. But this has been the general pattern for many years.

Expected Changes in Aggregate Need-Based and Non-Need-Based Grant Aid To Undergraduate and Graduate/Professional School Students

Table One on the next page displays the total dollars that states awarded in 1990-91 and 1991-92 and the total dollars they expect to award in 1992-93 in need-based and non-need-based grants to undergraduates and graduate/professional school students. These data are the sums of totals that appear in this and last year's reports in Tables 2 through 5. The data show that this year's expected increases are substantially more than last year's actual increases.

TABLE ONE

ACTUAL 1990-91, 1991-92, AND ESTIMATED 1992-93 NEED-BASED AND NON-NEED-BASED GRANT AID AWARDED TO UNDERGRADUATES AND GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL STUDENTS, BY STATES
(amounts in millions)

	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	Pct Change 1990 to 1991	Pct Change 1991 to 1992	Pct Change 1990 to 1992
ALABAMA	$ 9.085	$ 7.311	$ 7.894	-19.5%	+ 8.0%	-13.1%
ALASKA	2.575	2.635	2.447	+ 2.3	- 7.1	- 5.0
ARIZONA	3.335	2.283	2.442	-31.5	+ 7.0	-26.8
ARKANSAS	4.640	5.465	7.134	+17.8	+30.5	+53.7
CALIFORNIA	164.398	175.525	153.645	+ 6.8	-12.5	- 6.5
COLORADO	22.769	22.732	25.937	- 0.2	+14.1	+13.9
CONNECTICUT	20.780	20.790	21.005	0.0	+ 1.0	+ 1.1
DELAWARE	1.460	1.287	1.535	-11.8	+19.3	+ 5.1
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	0.974	1.029	1.068	+ 5.6	+ 3.8	+ 9.7
FLORIDA	63.211	72.356	76.339	+14.5	+ 5.5	+20.8
GEORGIA	20.536	19.620	24.377	- 4.5	+24.2	+18.7
HAWAII	0.612	0.632	0.724	+ 3.3	+14.6	+18.3
IDAHO	0.725	0.869	1.012	+19.9	+16.5	+39.6
ILLINOIS	201.639	203.707	221.650	+ 1.0	+ 8.8	+ 9.9
INDIANA	47.675	50.838	56.191	+ 6.6	+10.5	+17.9
IOWA	36.437	35.299	34.859	- 3.1	- 1.2	- 4.3
KANSAS	6.491	6.620	6.954	+ 2.0	+ 5.0	+ 7.1
KENTUCKY	19.866	16.996	20.520	-14.4	+20.7	+ 3.3
LOUISIANA	4.459	5.138	7.666	+15.2	+49.2	+71.9
MAINE	4.802	5.002	5.200	+ 4.2	+ 4.0	+ 8.3
MARYLAND	21.262	21.958	26.825	+ 3.3	+22.2	+26.2
MASSACHUSETTS	46.000	23.940	46.239	-48.0	+93.1	+ 0.5
MICHIGAN	71.789	81.284	78.689	+13.2	- 3.2	+ 9.6
MINNESOTA	74.656	81.341	83.190	+ 9.0	+ 2.3	+11.4
MISSISSIPPI	1.177	1.222	1.351	+ 3.8	+10.6	+14.8
MISSOURI	19.826	20.057	21.367	+ 1.2	+ 6.5	+ 7.8
MONTANA	0.383	0.414	0.418	+ 8.1	+ 1.0	+ 9.1
NEBRASKA	2.192	2.370	2.613	+ 8.1	+10.3	+19.2
NEVADA	0.365	0.384	0.401	+ 5.2	+ 4.4	+ 9.9
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0.776	0.832	1.263	+ 7.2	+51.8	+62.8
NEW JERSEY	96.482	110.054	128.974	+14.1	+17.2	+33.7
NEW MEXICO	10.866	7.928	9.025	-27.0	+13.8	-16.9
NEW YORK	460.133	523.434	577.100	+13.8	+10.3	+25.4
NORTH CAROLINA	28.385	28.279	28.542	- 0.4	+ 0.9	+ 0.6
NORTH DAKOTA	1.469	1.799	2.459	+22.5	+36.7	+67.4
OHIO	81.276	81.799	94.131	+ 0.6	+15.1	+15.8
OKLAHOMA	16.105	18.434	19.221	+14.5	+ 4.3	+19.3
OREGON	11.809	12.023	12.606	+ 1.8	+ 4.8	+ 6.7
PENNSYLVANIA	142.897	158.612	173.376	+11.0	+ 9.3	+21.3
RHODE ISLAND	9.638	9.141	9.586	- 5.2	+ 4.9	- 0.5
SOUTH CAROLINA	17.901	16.800	17.105	- 6.2	+ 1.8	- 4.4
SOUTH DAKOTA	0.556	0.570	0.677	+ 2.5	+18.8	+21.8
TENNESSEE	13.768	13.340	14.590	- 3.1	+ 9.4	+ 6.0
TEXAS	26.674	30.204	30.288	+13.2	+ 0.3	+13.5
UTAH	2.397	1.940	2.022	-19.1	+ 4.2	-15.6
VERMONT	10.333	11.171	11.271	+ 8.1	+ 0.9	+ 9.1
VIRGINIA	25.458	24.067	26.879	- 5.5	+11.7	+ 5.6
WASHINGTON	21.095	23.527	23.571	+11.5	+ 0.2	+11.7
WEST VIRGINIA	5.559	5.781	5.868	+ 4.0	+ 1.5	+ 5.6
WISCONSIN	42.933	43.445	45.936	+ 1.2	+ 5.7	+ 7.0
WYOMING	0.212	0.216	0.225	+ 1.9	+ 4.2	+ 6.1
PUERTO RICO	17.898	17.611	22.433	- 1.6	+27.4	+25.3
Totals	$1,918.739	$2,030.111	$2,196.850	+ 5.8%	+ 8.2%	+14.5%
State Average				+ 1.5%	+12.0%	+13.1%
Standard Deviation				13.0%	16.8%	19.3%

Between 1990-91 and 1991-92, aggregate grant dollars from the four basic types of programs grew by 5.8 percent, from $1.919 billion to $2.030 billion. This year the total is expected to grow by 8.2 percent, to $2.197 billion. Thus, in two years, total grant dollars will have grown by 14.5 percent.

In 1991-92, 16 states awarded fewer total dollars than they awarded in 1990-91. Only four states expect to award fewer total dollars this year than in 1991-92. The 16 states that awarded fewer dollars in 1991-92 than in 1990-91 include: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Mexico, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Puerto Rico. The four states that expect to award fewer dollars this year than last are Alaska, California, Iowa, and Michigan.

This year nine states expect to increase their grant dollars expenditures by more than 20 percent over last year's expenditures. They include, in order of percentage rate increases: Massachusetts, 93.1 percent; New Hampshire, 51.8 percent; Louisiana, 49.2 percent; North Dakota, 36.7 percent; Arkansas, 30.5 percent; Puerto Rico, 27.4 percent; Georgia, 24.2 percent; Maryland, 22.2 percent; and Kentucky, 20.7 percent. Massachusetts' large percentage growth rate is in part a consequence of restoring increased funds after a 48 percent cut between 1990-91 and 1991-92. The increases in Georgia and Kentucky also helped compensate for cuts made between 1990-91 and 1991-92.

Because many states expect to increase their award dollars this year to help make up for last year's losses, only nine states expect to award fewer total dollars in 1992-93 than two years ago, in 1990-91: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Iowa, New Mexico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Utah. In 1990-91, these states combined to award $256,632,000. This year they expect to collectively award 7.8 percent fewer dollars, $236,583,000. Four of the nine states expect "double-digit" losses over amounts awarded in 1990-91: Arizona, 26.8 percent; New Mexico, 16.9 percent; Utah, 15.6 percent; and Alabama, 13.1 percent.

Although 43 states expect to increase their total grant dollars awarded between 1990-91 and 1992-93, only 17 expect increases that should keep pace with increases in costs, at least 16 percent. The other 26 states expect to increase their total expenditures but the increases will not have kept pace with their students' increased college costs.

Here are the states with substantial increases, in rank order of their percentage increases: Louisiana, 71.9 percent; North Dakota, 67.4 percent; New Hampshire, 62.8 percent; Arkansas, 53.7 percent; Idaho, 39.6 percent; New Jersey, 33.6 percent; Maryland, 26.2 percent; New York, 25.4 percent; Puerto Rico, 25.3 percent; South Dakota, 21.8 percent; Pennsylvania, 21.3 percent; Florida, 20.8 percent; Oklahoma, 19.3 percent; Nebraska, 19.2 percent; Georgia, 18.7 percent; Hawaii, 18.3 percent; and Indiana, 17.9 percent.

Six of the 17 states with substantial increases are each expected to spend under $2.7 million this year: Idaho, Hawaii, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Arkansas and Louisiana are expected to spend under $7.7 million. Therefore, while these eight states' growth rates are laudable, their dollar increases are relatively small. New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania each expect to spend at least $128 million this year, so those states' dollar

growths are as significant as their percentage growth rates. Florida and Indiana each expect to spend more than $56 million, and Georgia, Maryland, Oklahoma, and Puerto Rico each expect to spend at least $19 million this year.

The largest dollar increases in state expenditures between 1990-91 and 1992-93 are expected in New York, $117 million; New Jersey, $32 million; and Pennsylvania, $30 million. In fact, the dollar increases in just those three states account for 64 percent of the total expected dollar increase of $278 million from all states' programs. The increase in New York alone represents 42 percent of the expected total increase.

The bottom row of data in Table One display the average percentage rate increases for all 52 states for the three time periods under examination. Because so many states experienced losses of funds between 1990-91 and 1991-92, the average or "per state" increase was only 1.5 percent. The average expected increase in 1992-93 is considerably greater, 12.0 percent. And the two-year average percentage rate growth is 13.1 percent, nearly the same as the growth in aggregate or combined dollars.

It is clear from these data that 1992-93 should be, in terms of growth in state grant dollars, a much better year than last year.

Other Aid Programs Administered By NASSGP Agencies

In addition to need-based and non-need-based grant programs for undergraduates and graduate/professional school students, NASSGP agencies also administer a wide variety of other types of student aid programs. They include Stafford, SLS, and PLUS Loan programs, work-study programs, institutional matching funds, and federal Douglas Scholarship and Byrd Honors Scholarship programs. The programs are listed in Table 6.

The diversity of programs listed in the table indicate, perhaps better than any other table in this report, the scope of financial aid programs supported by states. Many NASSGP agencies, 36 in all, administer the federal Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship program, and 13 also administer the federal Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship program.

Sixteen states indicated their NASSGP agencies also administer loans programs under the Federal Family Education Loan Programs in their states, but an additional six states' NASSGP agencies have responsibilities for FFELP programs: Delaware, Florida, Indiana, North Carolina, Oregon, and Vermont.

Seventeen states reported administering some type of state-funded work-study or student employment program: California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Vermont, and Washington. These states appropriated over $51 million for work-study programs for 1992-93 with Washington appropriating $12,211,000; Colorado, $9,872,000; Michigan, $6,231,000; and Minnesota, $5,869,000. Five other states, Iowa, Kentucky, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, each expect to spend more than $1 million on work-study programs this year.

Programs to assist education majors and teachers are rather common, with 18 states reporting one or more scholarship, loan, scholarship/loan, and/or loan forgiveness programs to assist these groups: Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Nurses and/or nursing students are specifically targeted for assistance by programs in 11 states: Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin. Fifteen states have aid programs for students of various health professions: Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, and West Virginia.

In addition to administering FFELP loan programs in behalf of the federal government, several NASSGP agencies also administer their own loan programs, usually funded from sales of revenue bonds. These include loan programs in Alaska, California, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Six agencies have "loan forgiveness" programs that repay all or part of borrowers' loans for various kinds of service to their states: California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Seven states' agencies reported tuition and fee waiver programs: Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Texas, and West Virginia. Colorado, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania each reported funding "matching" programs whose funds are used to leverage contributions to student aid programs from federal and private sources.

The scope and diversity of the types and purposes of the programs indicate that the states employ financial aid programs for multiple purposes for myriad student groups.

Other State-Funded Aid Programs

Table 7 lists 95 state-supported programs that 26 respondents reported were administered by other "non-NASSGP" agencies in their states. Most of these programs assist health professions students, aid veterans or their dependents, or provide tuition waivers to various student groups.

SSIG Program Activities By States

Table 8 displays the State Student Incentive Grant Program activities by states. The 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico reported spending $62,308,060 in SSIG funds in 1991-92. They anticipate spending 14 percent more, $71,380,801, in 1992-93.

Nine states each expect to spend more than $2 million in SSIG funds this year. California expects to spend $11.06 million; New York, $6.08 million; Illinois, $4.20 million; Texas, $3.60 million; Pennsylvania, $3.16 million; Michigan, $2.97 million; Ohio, $2.85 million; Massachusetts, $2.31 million; and Florida, $2.25 million. These nine states will combine to spend $38.5 million,

about 54 percent of the SSIG funds for all 52 states. Another 14 states each expect to spend at least $1 million. Their combined dollars should total $18.97 million. Therefore, 23 states are expected to spend over 80 percent of the total SSIG funds.

Twelve of the 52 states expect at least one-third of the total need-based grant dollars they award to come from SSIG funds. Alabama, Arizona, the District of Columbia, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming expect about half their need-based grant dollars to come from the SSIG program. On the other hand, SSIG funds should represent under 2 percent of the need-based grant dollars awarded by Iowa, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

The expected median percentage of SSIG funds as a percent of total need-based grant dollars is about 7.4 percent, with 17 states' SSIG funds representing under 5 percent of their award dollars. The average for the 52 states is 16.4 percent, with a standard deviation of 16.8 percentage points, indicating that there is a large variation in matching rates.

Years of Program Initiation

Table 9 shows when the 213 programs with reported initiation dates first began to make awards to students. The frequency distribution of initiation dates is as follows:

	Number of Programs	Percent
1970 or Before	41	19.2%
1971 to 1975	47	22.1
1976 to 1980	33	15.5
1981 to 1985	37	17.4
1986 to 1990	46	21.6
1991 to 1992	9	4.2
All Years	213	100.0%

About one-fourth of the programs were initiated in 1986 or later years, but one-fifth began serving students in 1970-71 or an earlier year. Before 1980, the vast majority of state grant programs were comprehensive, need-based programs that served undergraduates attending many different kinds of institutions. Programs implemented since the mid-1980s are frequently non-need-based and designed to serve special categories of students and/or meet special state needs.

New Grant Programs For 1992-93

Only three programs were identified as new ones for 1992-93. They include two need-based grant programs for undergraduates, Delaware's Governor's Workforce Development Grant program and Massachusetts' Cash Grants program; and a non-need-based, merit-based scholarship program for undergraduates, Louisiana's Honors Scholarship program. Delaware's program expects to award $21,000 to 68 students, the Massachusetts program expects to award $10,000,000 to 11,100 students, and the Louisiana program expects to award $1,839,000 to 1,021 students.

These three programs' combined award dollars, $11.86 million, should represent about 0.5 percent of all combined need-based and non-need-based grant dollars awarded by states to undergraduates in 1992-93, and about 7.2 percent of the expected increase in grant dollars from 1991-92 to 1992-93.

Need Analysis Methodologies Used By State Programs

Fourteen states use only the Congressional Methodology (CM) for their 33 need-based grant programs (see Table 9). These states include: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Another 11 states use the CM for 20 need-based grant programs while employing some other need analysis system for one or more additional programs. These states include: Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Washington. Seven of these 11 states, California, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, and Washington, also use a modified version of the CM for ten programs. Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Vermont use a "modified CM" to administer nine programs.

A few states use the CM or some other need analysis system for their programs. The states that accept the CM and some other need analysis system for the same program include: the District of Columbia, Minnesota, Mississippi, and Texas. Texas has four programs that use multiple need analysis systems, the others have one each.

Four states, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Tennessee, and Puerto Rico, use the Pell Grant need analysis system for 1992-93 for their ten programs. It is assumed that they will substitute the new CM for the Pell Grant system in 1993-94.

Ten states let their students' postsecondary institutions decide which need analysis systems they will use to determine student eligibility. They include: Alabama, Arizona, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, South Dakota, and Wyoming. This policy applies to 14 programs administered by these ten states.

Nine states use their own need analysis systems to determine student need for 11 programs: Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

Maximum Annual Grant Awards

Table 9 displays the maximum award dollar amounts students may receive from 188 programs where a specific dollar figure was reported. The median maximum award is $2,300, up from the 1991-92 median of $2,000. The median for 1990-91 was $2,140; for 1989-90, $2,070; and, for 1988-89, $1,970. Thus maximum awards seem to be growing at a fairly slow pace. Here is the frequency distribution of known maximum awards for 1992-93:

	Number of Programs	Percent
Under $500	9	4.8%
$500 to $999	17	9.0
$1,000 to $1,499	30	16.0
$1,500 to $1,999	23	12.2
$2,000 to $2,499	25	13.3
$2,500 to $2,999	21	11.2
$3,000 to $3,999	19	10.1
$4,000 to $4,999	15	8.0
$5,000 to $5,999	10	5.3
$6,000 to $6,999	4	2.1
$7,000 to $7,999	3	1.6
$8,000 to $8,999	1	0.5
$9,000 to $9,999	0	0.0
$10,000 and Above	11	5.9
All Programs	188	100.0%

The largest maximum awards are for graduate students, usually in the health professions: Alaska's WAMI Medical Exchange program, $37,262, and its Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) program, $22,800; North Carolina's Board of Governor's Medical Scholarship program, $26,000; and Utah's WICHE program, $18,400.

Of the 49 states that listed maximum awards for their largest need-based programs for undergraduates, 32 or 65.3 percent listed no changes from their 1991-92 maximum. Nine states reported increased maximum awards this year: Hawaii, 25.0 percent; Texas, 16.9 percent; West Virginia, 8.2 percent; Connecticut, 6.0 percent; Ohio, 4.9 percent; Pennsylvania, 4.3 percent; Oregon, 3.9 percent; Kentucky, 2.9 percent; and Minnesota, 2.5 percent. Eight states reported reduced maximum awards: Rhode Island, 33 percent; Florida, 24.8 percent; Colorado, 20.0 percent; California, 15.2 percent; Washington, 13.6 percent; Michigan, 5.8 percent; Vermont, 3.9 percent; and New Jersey, 17.7 percent. California, Vermont, and Washington expect to award fewer total dollars in 1992-93 than last year, so cutting their maximum awards may represent a strategy for spreading fewer dollars among more students.

Merit and Need-Based Eligibility Criteria

About 59 percent of the state grant programs that identified need, non-need, or merit eligibility criteria are need-based (see Table 9). Students must demonstrate financial need to qualify for an award from these 125 programs. About 19 percent of the need-based programs also require applicants to meet merit criteria to receive an initial award. Merit is usually measured by academic aptitude test scores and/or grade point averages. (Virtually all programs require recipients to demonstrate "merit" in the form of satisfactory academic progress to receive a renewal award.)

About 44 percent of the non-need-based programs employ merit criteria for establishing applicant eligibility, primarily because many are merit scholarship programs. Here are the numbers of programs with various eligibility criteria:

Need-Based Only	101	47.4%
Need/Merit-Based	24	11.3
Total Need-Based	125	58.7
Non-Need-Based Only	49	23.0
Non-Need/Merit-Based	39	18.3
Total Non-Need-Based	88	41.3
Total Merit-Based	63	29.6

Here is a distribution of state grant program need- and merit-based criteria for the 187 programs reported for five years ago, in 1987-88:

Need-Based Only	83	44.4%
Need/Merit-Based	21	11.2
Total Need-Based	104	55.6
Non-Need-Based Only	36	19.3
Non-Need/Merit-Based	47	25.1
Total Non-Need-Based	83	44.4
Total Merit-Based	68	36.3

Comparing the 1987-88 to the 1992-93 data shows that need-based programs have grown at a higher rate than non-need-based ones, 20.2 percent versus 6 percent, and the number of programs with merit criteria has declined by 7.4 percent. The largest growth rate is for non-need-based programs with no merit eligibility criteria, 36.1 percent, from 36 to 49.

Program Eligible Institutions

The survey asked respondents to list the types of institutions where grant recipients could use their awards: public and private four-year and two-year colleges, public and private vocational-technical schools, public and private schools of nursing, and "other" institutions. About 48 percent of the programs (101 out of 212) can be considered "comprehensive" in that their awards can be used at public and private four-year and two-year colleges and at least one other type of postsecondary institution (see Table 10).

Here is a frequency distribution of the number of states with programs that serve students at each institutional type in 1992-93:

	States	Programs	Pct. of Programs
Four-Year Public Colleges	51	180	84.9%
Four-Year Private Colleges	51	164	77.4
Two-Year Public Colleges	51	150	70.8
Two-Year Private Colleges	47	132	62.3
Public Vo-Tech Schools	38	88	41.5
Private Vo-Tech Schools	35	75	35.4
Public Nursing Schools	36	86	40.6
Private Nursing Schools	35	80	37.7

Over three-fourths of the programs serve four-year college students. Only one state, Wyoming, has no programs to serve four-year private colleges, because it has none; and South Carolina's program serves only private colleges.

Here is a comparison of the numbers of programs serving students at the different institutional types for 1987-88 and 1992-93:

	1987-88	1992-93	Percentage Change
Four-Year Public Colleges	156	180	15.4%
Four-Year Private Colleges	149	164	10.1
Two-Year Public Colleges	131	150	14.5
Two-Year Private Colleges	115	132	14.8
Public Vo-Tech Schools	71	88	23.9
Private Vo-Tech Schools	61	75	22.9
Public Nursing Schools	73	86	17.8
Private Nursing Schools	73	80	9.6

The numbers of programs serving vocational-technical school students increased by the greatest proportion during the past five years.

Table 11 displays the responses of states that offered comments believed to help readers better understand their programs' situations.

SECTION III

PROGRAM CHANGES, POLICY ISSUES, AND RELATED MATTERS

This Report section describes the Survey responses to a variety of questions, some of which are asked on all surveys and others which were asked just this year.

Significant Program Changes Planned in 1993-94

Twenty-nine states reported anticipated significant changes in programs, policies, and practices for the 1993-94 academic year (see Table 12). The most frequently mentioned are consequences of changes in the federal application process and need analysis system as a result of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1992.

Changes in the federal student aid application process are expected to significantly affect the way states receive and/or process application information in eight states: Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee. Changes in the Congressional Methodology (CM), which frequently reduce expected family contributions and increase financial need, are expected to force eight states to revise their grant award schedules: Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, Washington, and West Virginia.

Ohio expects to reorganize administration of its grant and loan programs by transferring programs currently administered by the Board of Regents to the Ohio Loan Commission and restructuring the latter agency into a new Ohio Student Financial Aid Commission. Virginia expects to consolidate the programs administered by the Department of Education with the programs administered by the Council of Higher Education. Florida expects to consolidate some of its programs to simplify the application and awards process.

When its Nursing Grant program becomes "campus-based," Colorado will be centrally administering just the Paul Douglas Scholarship program. All other programs will be administered through their applicants' postsecondary institutions.

Minnesota plans to change its definition of full-time students from 12 to 15 credits per term and eliminate "part-time" grants by awarding grants on the basis of three or more credit hours per term. Missouri may amend its statute to award grants to college students who did not earn high school diplomas.

Due to fiscal problems in their states, Oregon may have to eliminate all grant programs but its Need Grant program and reduce its funding by 6 percent, Wisconsin may have to cut funding of its grants programs by 2.5 percent, and Vermont expects reduced funding of its programs.

Utah has requested additional funds to meet new, larger required matches for the federal SSIG, SEOG, and Work-Study programs. Mississippi plans to participate in the SREB Minority Doctoral Fellowship program on a limited basis.

New Programs Planned or Under Consideration for 1993-94 or 1994-95

Fourteen states reported that they are considering implementing new programs in 1993 or 1994 (see Table 13). Louisiana, Maryland, New York, and Texas hope to implement programs already authorized but not yet funded. Massachusetts intends to implement two new loan programs, the No Interest Loan and Massachusetts Plan Loan programs. Rhode Island also plans to implement a new loan program, the Family Education Loan program, to offer lower-interest loans to middle-income families.

Delaware plans to implement a Guaranteed Tuition Plan for low- and middle-income students and South Carolina is discussing starting a College Savings Plan, which was initially structured as a guaranteed tuition plan.

Tennessee and Virginia hope to implement their state's version of the "Taylor Plan" in which young junior high and high school students are guaranteed financial assistance for college if they meet financial need and other academic criteria.

Missouri and Ohio plan for grant programs to make awards to part-time students. Missouri is also planning four other programs: a scholarship program for students with artistic ability, a graduate student scholarship program, a minority teachers scholarship program, and a Vietnam War Veterans scholarship program.

Maryland and West Virginia want to implement grant programs for students planning careers in the health professions.

Kansas and South Carolina will propose need-based grant programs to assist students attending four-year public colleges.

Effects of the Recession on State Grant Programs

The Survey asked states to estimate the effects of the recession on their students and programs. Thirty-eight states responded to this request (see Table 14). Two-thirds of the respondents, 26 states, reported that their applications for financial assistance had risen substantially because of the recession.

Six states reported having to reduce their maximum or average awards to meet the increased demand for assistance: District of Columbia, Florida, Michigan, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Indiana, Maryland, and West Virginia have cut the numbers or proportions of applicants receiving awards.

Idaho, Iowa, and North Carolina reported that funding of their grant programs has been slowed by the recession. Montana noted that its colleges had to increase their tuitions.

Six states reported no significant effects of the recession on their application patterns: Delaware, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin.

Efforts to Compensate for Tuition Increases

The Survey asked what steps, if any, states had taken to help alleviate the effects on students of rising tuitions. Thirty-two states responded to this question (see Table 15). Six states reported that portions of the revenue received by institutions from increased tuitions must be set aside for financial aid for needy students: California, Colorado, Illinois, North Carolina, Oregon, and Texas. West Virginia indicated that a portion of the fee revenue collected by the public colleges is given to the State Grant program for awards to needy students.

Nine states reported increasing their average grant awards to compensate for increased tuitions: Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. Three states, Massachusetts, Tennessee, and Virginia, increased appropriations to their grant programs while three other states, Connecticut, Missouri, and New Mexico, responded by requesting additional funds. Washington expects funding of its centrally-administered aid programs to increase by an amount equal to 24 percent of the additional revenue derived from tuition increases. Florida increased appropriations to state universities from lottery funds to help fund financial aid for needy students.

New Jersey established a Tuition Stabilization Incentive Grant Program to provide additional funds to public colleges that do not raise their tuitions by more than 4.5 percent over their 1992 levels. Ohio "capped" tuition increases at public institutions at 9.5 percent for 1992-93.

Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, and Vermont reported that they could not increase awards. Montana indicated that it responded to tuition increases by not cutting its grant program awards while other state-funded programs were being cut.

Effects of Changes in Agency Grant Programs on College Enrollment Limits

Only six states responded to the Survey question on the effects of changes in their grant programs on college enrollments (see Table 16). Alaska indicated that rising costs and relatively flat appropriations for grants have diminished its ability to recruit and retain students. Florida and Illinois reported no major effects of grants on enrollments. Maryland indicated that enrollments had shifted as a consequence of changing tuition levels. South Carolina reported that private college enrollments had been limited by grant funding levels. Minnesota reported no enrollment effects to date but anticipates that requiring students to take 15 credits per term to qualify for full-time awards may encourage them to complete their degrees on a more timely basis.

Potential Effects of the New Federal Need Analysis System

With the passage of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1992, the method by which student and family ability to pay for postsecondary education as assessed by the Congressional Methodology (CM) was changed substantially. Most states use the CM to assess their applicants' need for state grant awards. Therefore, the Survey asked respondents to estimate the effects of changes in the CM on their programs. Forty-eight states offered responses to this item (see Table 17).

While most states expect changes in the new CM to affect their programs, no states that currently use the federal methodology for need analysis indicated they would go to some other system. The most frequently anticipated consequence of using the new CM is that the number of awards states make will decline. Nine states indicated that, because expected family contributions will decrease and need increase, they are likely to make fewer grant awards to students in 1993-94: Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, New Hampshire, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. In addition to making fewer awards, Arizona and Wisconsin also anticipated making smaller average awards. Iowa and South Carolina also predicted that their average awards would be smaller. Smaller and/or fewer awards are expected by the 11 states because the demonstrated need for assistance is expected to rise at a faster rate than program funding.

Eleven states said they could not predict the effects or that there would be no direct effect on their programs because they were not centrally-administered. These states included: Alabama, Colorado, Idaho, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, and Wyoming. Four states anticipated no significant effects on their programs from using the new CM: District of Columbia, Louisiana, Missouri, and North Dakota. Alaska expected all but one of its campuses to use the CM with no major effects.

Eight states anticipated major changes to the ways they process grant applications, indicating they probably would have to devise rationing methods or otherwise modify the CM for it to meet their purposes: Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia.

It is important to note that these responses reflect the states' viewpoints as of September and October, 1992, when the Survey data were being collected. As the states learn more about the effects of the new CM on expected family contributions, more may decide that they have to make changes in their awards practices to compensate for the changes in federal need analysis. As this is being written, in March, 1993, there already is indication that more than eight states have had to make major changes.

State Funds Appropriated to Institutions for Financial Aid

The compilers of annual NASSGP Survey Reports recognize that Survey results do not always reflect every state's total financial commitment to student aid programs, even grant programs. Virtually all public institutions in all states use some of their general appropriations to help fund grant programs on their campuses. These dollars could be considered a part of the states' support of grant programs. Unfortunately, in most states the actual amounts of appropriations used for grant aid are not readily available, if they are available at all. Therefore, this and previous Surveys have not attempted to collect these data.

However, when states make appropriations to institutions that are earmarked specifically for financial aid purposes, the data on these appropriations should be available. This year's Survey asked respondents to identify such appropriations in their states. The data that 20 states provided are displayed in Table 18. The total dollars sum to $422,477,000. The largest dollar amounts were reported by California, $130 million; New York, $68 million; Virginia, $43 million; North Carolina, $36 million; and Colorado, $35 million. These five states' combined dollars represent about 74 percent of the total from all 20 states. Just as grant aid from NASSGP agencies is concentrated in a relatively few states, so are earmarked financial aid appropriations.

The Survey asked the states to estimate what proportion of the appropriations dollars were used for grants, scholarships, fellowships, and tuition remission awards, i.e., all types of "gift aid." Five states could not provide estimates: Florida, North Carolina, Texas, Utah, and Virginia. But about 82 percent of the dollars from the 15 states that could provide estimates were reportedly used for "gift aid." Therefore, assuming that 82 percent of the dollars for the five states that couldn't provide the data were used for "gift aid," then over $345 million of the $422 million was used for "gift aid" or "grants" as they are defined by the Survey.

This means that the 52 states in the NASSGP Survey population could be providing up to $2,917,341,000 in "grant" assistance of some kind to students in 1992-93, about 13 percent more than the aggregate amount reported in Table 1, $2,571,755,000. Put another way, the Table 1 data underestimated the total amounts states will spend on grant aid by 11.8 percent ($2,917,341,000 minus $2,571,755,000 equals $345,586,000; $345,586,000 divided by $2,971,341,000 equals 11.8 percent).

Are the underestimates greater for some states than others? Appropriations amounts for the states that provided grant percentage estimates were added to the total amounts reported in Table 1 and then the sum was compared to the first total. Here are the results of the comparisons:

California	35.5 percent	Colorado	42.9 percent
Connecticut	32.6 percent	Delaware	57.8 percent
Dist. of Columbia	35.2 percent	Hawaii	83.6 percent
Iowa	30.2 percent	Maryland	2.7 percent
Nebraska	49.9 percent	New Hampshire	19.4 percent
New Mexico	23.5 percent	New York	3.6 percent
Oregon	9.0 percent	Washington	32.5 percent
Puerto Rico	23.2 percent	All 15 States	19.9 percent

The underestimates range from a low of 2.7 percent, for Maryland, to a high of 83.6 percent, for Hawaii. For all 15 states with estimated grant percentages, the combined underestimate works out to 19.9 percent. Because the data in Table 1 substantially underestimate the total state funding of grants for these 15 states, next year's report will include these amounts in Table 1 under "Other Aid."

The Survey asked whether full-time and part-time or undergraduates and graduate/professional school students could receive awards from the appropriations to institutions. Nine of the 20 states said that all four categories of students could receive aid. Five states said that only full-time or part-time undergraduates could receive awards: Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Nebraska, and New Hampshire. Only full-time undergraduates were eligible to receive awards from appropriations from Delaware, New Mexico, and Oregon. Only part-time undergraduates could receive awards from Maryland. Full-time undergraduates and graduate/professional school students could receive awards from Virginia and Puerto Rico.

The types of institutions at which appropriations could be used varied considerably among the states. Nineteen of the states allowed their funds to be used at public colleges. Only Oregon's funds could be used just at four-year

private colleges. These eight states allowed appropriations to be used at private colleges: Connecticut, Maryland, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, and Puerto Rico. Four states, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and New York, allowed use of funds at vocational-technical schools. New York was the only state to allow their use at nursing schools.

The Survey asked what types of awards could be funded with the earmarked appropriations: tuition remission awards, grants, long-term loans, student employment, graduate fellowships/assistantships, scholarships, and federal matching funds (for institutional matches under the campus-based federal programs). Only Florida and Washington allowed their funds to be used for all seven types of awards, but California, New York, and North Carolina allowed their funds to be used for all but long-term loans. Only Colorado indicated its awards could not be used for grants or scholarships. Its funds were restricted to tuition remission awards.

Nine of the 20 states said their funds could be used only for need-based awards: California, Connecticut, Maryland, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Oregon, Texas, Washington, and Puerto Rico. Just three states said the financial need was not a criteria for receipt of awards from their funds: Colorado, Iowa, and New Mexico. The remaining eight states said that at least some of their funds were used for need-based assistance.

SECTION IV

FIVE-YEAR TRENDS IN NEED-BASED UNDERGRADUATE GRANT DOLLAR EXPENDITURES BY STATES

This section of the report describes the state-by-state trends in dollar expenditures on need-based grant aid to undergraduates for 1987-88 through 1992-93. Because need-based grant aid to undergraduates represents three-fourths of all state grant aid, trends in these types of grants deserve special attention. The emphasis in this section of the report is on assessing how the patterns of funding have changed during the five years since 1987-88.

The first assessment involves comparing the states' grant dollar expenditures for this year with the expenditures for 1987-88. The data in Table 19 show that the median five-year percentage growth rate is 31.3 percent, with combined dollars from all states growing by about 39.6 percent. The expected average growth rate for the 52 states is higher, about 48 percent, because nine states expect to increase their award dollars by over 80 percent. Six states expect to spend more than twice the amounts in 1992-93 that they spent in 1987-88: North Dakota, a 341.2 percent increase; Maine, 266.7 percent; Louisiana, 172.6 percent; Nebraska, 138.8 percent; Maryland, 138.4 percent; and New Mexico, 102.0 percent. Alaska expects to increase its award dollars by 95.8 percent, Florida expects a 92.1 percent increase, and Washington expects an 89.7 percent increase.

Here is a frequency distribution of the expected five-year percentage changes for the 52 states:

Up 100 Percent or More	6	LA, ME, MD, NE, MN, & ND
Up 90 to 99 Percent	2	AK & FL
Up 80 to 89 Percent	1	WA
Up 60 to 69 Percent	4	AR, ID, KY, NJ
Up 50 to 59 Percent	4	CO, NH, PA, & VA
Up 40 to 49 Percent	4	CT, IL, NY, & PR
Up 30 to 39 Percent	6	DE, IA, MN, MO, OH, & VT
Up 20 to 29 Percent	8	CA, HI, IN, KS, OK, OR, TX, & WI
Up 10 to 19 Percent	3	RI, SD, & WV
Up 1 to 9 Percent	6	AL, GA, MI, MS, SC, & TN
Down 1 to 9 Percent	5	DC, MT, NV, UT, & WY
Down 20 to 29 Percent	2	AZ & MA
Down 30 Percent or More	1	NC

Eight states expect to spend less, but 13 states expect to spend at least 60 percent more, in 1992-93 than they spent five years ago.

The 19 states expected to award more than $20 million this year have consistently awarded over 90 percent of the total dollars. The five states with the largest annual dollar volumes (New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, California, and New Jersey) awarded between 57 and 62 percent of the total combined dollars during the five-year period. The five largest states expect to increase their total dollars by 48.7 percent and the 14 next largest states expect their combined dollars to grow by 26 percent.

Seven states expect to award over $10 million but less than $17 million this year: Colorado, Missouri, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Vermont. These states expect to increase their combined grant dollars by 24.5 percent, with Colorado's 58.8 percent increase accounting for about 30 percent of the combined expected growth.

Eight states expect to award over $5 million but less than $10 million in 1992-93: Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Virginia, and West Virginia. Their combined grant dollars are expected to grow by 57.5 percent, primarily because Louisiana, Maine, and New Mexico expect to more than double their expenditures.

The remaining 18 states are each expected to award under $5 million, with seven (Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, South Dakota, and Wyoming) awarding under $1 million. These 18 states' combined grant dollars are expected to grow by just 11.3 percent. And seven of them (Arizona, District of Columbia, Montana, Nevada, North Carolina, Utah, and Wyoming) expect to award fewer dollars this year than five years ago.

States with smaller programs in 1987-88 and later years generally expect to experience little growth in award dollars. There are, however, some exceptions to this generalization. North Dakota expects to increase its award dollars by 341 percent, Nebraska expects a 139 percent increase, and Alaska expects a 96 percent increase. The combined dollars from the other 15 states are expected to decrease by 3.2 percent, from $22,159,000 to $21,445,000.

Most states' growth patterns are not consistently upward. A year of growth may be followed by a year or two of losses, or vice versa. For example, only 12 of the 52 states experienced growth in each year after 1987-88: Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Washington, and West Virginia.

Because the growth patterns are not consistently in one direction, a comparison of changes from five years ago to the current year does not present a complete picture of the five-year trends. There are better ways to assess growth patterns. The first is to examine "net dollar" changes in growth patterns, adding when a state's dollars increase but subtracting when they decrease in the following year. The second way is to look at the average annual award amounts for two sets of combined years. The third is to combine the two comparisons. The data for these comparisons are displayed in Table 20.

The first comparisons are for 1988-89 to 1990-91 and for 1990-91 to 1992-93, to derive two-year growth patterns around the "middle" year, 1990-91. The first state listed in Table 20, California, will serve as an example of how the comparisons were made. California increased its grant dollars from $129,264,000 in 1988-89 to $153,045,000 in 1989-90 and then to $161,642,000 in 1990-91, for a "net change" of $32,378,000 ($153,045,000 minus $129,264,000 equals $23,781,000; $161,642,000 minus $153,045,000 equals $8,597,000; $23,781,000 plus $8,597,000 equals $32,378,000).

Between 1990-91 and 1991-92, California increased its award dollars from $161,642,000 to $172,852,000, a positive difference of $11,210,000. But then California expects to decrease its dollars between 1991-92 and 1992-93 by $21,473,000, from $172,852,000 to $151,379,000. Therefore, the "net change" in

the most recent two-year period is a "negative" $10,263,000 ($11,210,000 minus $21,473,000 equals negative $10,263,000). The difference in the "net change" between the most recent two-year period and the first two-year period is a "negative" $42,641,000 ($32,378,000 minus negative $10,263,000 equals negative $42,641,000). This demonstrates that the growth in California's program was sharply curtailed in the most recent two-year period.

When the "Difference" columns were examined, it was discovered that 24 states had smaller "net changes" in the most recent years, between 1990-91 and 1992-93, than in the earlier two-year period, 1988-89 to 1990-91. This means that almost half the states' program growth slowed in the more recent time period.

Eight of the 19 states awarding more than $20 million, five of the seven states awarding at least $10 million, six of the eight states awarding at least $5 million, and five of the 18 states awarding under $5 million expect reduced "net changes" in the more recent time period. Therefore, it does not appear that differences in "net changes" are closely related to the states' program sizes. Regardless of their program's sizes, almost half the states expect to experience reduced growth in the most recent years.

The last three columns of Table 20 display the average annual award amounts for the first and most recent two-year periods. Thirteen states expect to spend smaller average annual award amounts in the most recent two-year period. Massachusetts is the only one of the 19 largest states expected to make smaller awards. South Carolina is the only one of the seven states awarding at least $10 million whose average annual awards are expected to decrease in the most recent years. Rhode Island and Virginia, among the eight states awarding at least $5 million, expect their average annual awards to decline. But nine of the 18 states awarding under $5 million expect their average annual awards to decline: Alabama, Arizona, District of Columbia, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, North Carolina, Utah, and Wyoming.

Therefore, it appears that the states with larger programs are much less likely than states with smaller programs to expect to award fewer average dollars in the most recent time period.

Combining these two types of analyses yields a third picture of trends. This involves considering whether the states' "net changes" were larger in the more recent time period and whether the increase in the average annual amounts awarded exceeded 16 percent. If states experienced, or expect to experience, greater "net changes" in the most recent time period and their average annual award dollars grew by at least 16 percent, it can be concluded that they have experienced "substantial and consistent" growth in their programs. For the average annual dollars to have kept pace with the growth in college costs and the consequent demand for grant aid, the most recent time period average would have to be at least 16 percent greater than the first average.

Just ten states met the criteria for "substantial and consistent" growth. Three were states expected to award more than $100 million this year: New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Maryland and Minnesota, among the 15 states with the next largest programs expect "substantial and consistent" growth. Arkansas, Colorado, and New Mexico were the only three of the 15 states expected to award at least $5 million that should meet the criteria. Idaho and North Dakota were the only states with the smallest programs that expected "substantial and consistent" growth.

Eighteen states' patterns fit into a second category in that they expect greater "net changes" in the most recent time period but their average annual awards are not expected to keep pace with increases in college costs. Six of them were among the states expected to award at least $20 million: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio, Puerto Rico, and Texas. Vermont was the only state in the "at least $10 million" group whose "net change" increased while its average annual awards did not grow enough to keep pace with costs. The 11 remaining states in this positive category all are expected to award under $5 million this year.

Sixteen states' patterns fit into a third category in that their "net changes" decreased in the most recent time period and their average annual dollars awarded did not keep pace with increases in costs. This is the most negative pattern of trends in aid dollars, because growth has slowed and average annual awards have not kept pace with costs. Two of these states were among those expected to award at least $100 million, California and Illinois. Two were among those expected to award at least $20 million, Iowa and Wisconsin.

The states who most often fit this negative pattern were those expected to award between $10 million and $20 million. Five of the seven states fit the pattern: Missouri, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Four of the eight states expected to award at least $5 million fit the pattern: Kansas, Rhode Island, Virginia, and West Virginia. Alabama, Arizona, and Delaware were the only smallest states to fall in this pattern category.

A fourth category includes eight states whose average annual awards for the most recent two-year period increased by at least 16 percent but their "net changes" decreased, indicating a slowing of growth. They include four states expected to award more than $20 million, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, and Washington; two states expected to award at least $5 million, Louisiana and Maine; and two states expected to award under $5 million, Alaska and Nebraska.

In closing this section of the report, it might be of interest to compare the numbers of states in each of the four categories of change to the numbers discovered in last year's analyses for the 1987-88 to 1989-90 and 1989-90 to 1991-92 time periods. Here are the data:

"Net Change" Increasing And Annual Average Awards Growing By More Than 16 Percent

Last Year	This Year
12	10

"Net Change" Increasing But Annual Average Awards Growing By Less Than 16 Percent

Last Year	This Year
23	18

"Net Change" Decreasing But Annual Average Awards Growing By More Than 16 Percent

Last Year	This Year
6	8

"Net Change" Decreasing And Annual Average Awards Growing By Less Than 16 Percent

Last Year	This Year
11	16

Last year 12 states were in the most positive category, with "substantial and consistent," growth patterns. This year only ten exhibited this pattern. Last year 29 states were included in the other two positive categories in that their "net changes" were increasing or their average awards increased at the pace of cost increases. This year only 26 states fell in these two categories.

Last year only 11 states fell in the most negative category with "net changes" and average awards both declining. Therefore, five states were added to the negative category, three states dropped out of the two "somewhat positive" categories, and two dropped out of the most positive "substantial and consistent" growth category.

What can be written to best summarize the five-year trends in growth in need-based grant dollars states make available to undergraduates? There is evidence of some positive trends for 36 out of 52 states. However, the number with positive trends has shrunk from last year's 41 states. Furthermore, 16 states, almost one-third of the total, are experiencing reduced "net changes" and their average annual award dollars are not keeping pace with increases in college costs. Four of these 16 states are among the 19 with the largest programs.

Although this year fewer states than last year expect to reduce their award dollars and more states expect substantial growth, these patterns generally will not compensate for the suppressed growth between 1989-90 and 1990-91 and between 1990-91 and 1991-92.

SECTION V

RANKINGS OF STATE GRANT PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

This section of the report responds to the requests of NASSGP members who find rankings of state grant program expenditures useful. The states are ranked in several ways: by estimated grant dollars per resident population; by grant dollars per resident "college-age" population; by grant dollars per full-time undergraduate enrollment; by percentage of full-time undergraduates receiving grant awards; and by total grant dollars as a percentage of appropriations for higher education operating expenses. These rankings are presented in Tables 21 to 25. However, the rankings have several limitations that may result in rank orders that can be considered misleading. For example, a simple rank order of dollars in grant aid per capita does not take into account differences in numbers of citizens enrolled in postsecondary institutions in each state, differences in student/family ability to pay for education, or differences in the costs of education, all of which would affect the need and demand for financial aid from a state's programs. Because of these limitations, these rankings should be interpreted with caution, considering what factors may and may not influence a particular state's rank.

Table 21 displays the 1992-93 rank order of states' need-based grants to undergraduates and total grants to all students in per capita dollars by their 1991 resident populations. Only seven states are expected to spend more than $10 per resident on need-based grants to undergraduates: New York, Vermont, Minnesota, Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Iowa. Twelve states are expected to spend more than $10 per capita in need- and non-need-based grants to all students: New York, Iowa, Vermont, Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Connecticut, North Carolina, New Mexico, and Indiana. Thirteen states are expected to spend less than $1 per resident on need-based grants to undergraduates, and seven states are expected to spend under $1 in need- and non-need-based grants per capita.

The average per capita state expenditure for need-based grants to undergraduates is $5.27; for all grant aid, $7.32. When all states' need-based grant dollars are divided by their combined populations, the average for the "nation" is $7.63; the average for the "nation" for all grant dollars is $10.10. The median for need-based grant dollars to undergraduates is $3.26; for total grant dollars, the median is $5.14.

The relationship between states' population sizes and per capita amounts spent on all grants, which was seen in last year's report, appears to have strengthened somewhat this year. In 1991-92, about 69 percent of the states (35 of 51) that ranked in the top and bottom halves of the distribution for total grant dollars per capita also ranked in the same halves of the distribution for total population. This year, nearly 75 percent of the states (38 of 51) that rank in the top and bottom halves of the distribution for total grants rank in the respective halves for total population. The most notable exceptions include Vermont, which ranks 50th in population but 3rd in total grants per resident; Rhode Island, 43rd in population but 13th in total grants per resident; and Iowa, 30th in population but 2nd in total grants per capita. Georgia, on the other hand, ranks 11th in total population but only 33rd in total grants per resident; Virginia, 12th versus 31st; Missouri, 15th versus 32nd; and Louisiana, 21st versus 40th.

Because over 70 percent of the total grant aid states award is for need-based aid to undergraduates, most states that rank high on total grants per capita also rank high on need-based aid per capita. Seventeen of the top 20 states on total grants per resident also rank in the top 20 on per capita undergraduate need-based grants (Oklahoma, North Carolina, and West Virginia are the exceptions).

Ranking states by per capita total population may not necessarily be the best ranking method, since younger residents are not old enough to attend and many older residents choose not to attend postsecondary institutions. Therefore, Table 22 displays the 1992-93 rank order of states' undergraduate need-based grants and total grants in per capita dollars based on their 1991 estimated "college-age" population, i.e., the number of persons aged 18 to 24. The data for total grants per capita show that only New York plans to spend more than $300 per "college-age" resident, and only Iowa plans to spend more than $200 per capita. Another eight states are expected to spend at least $100 per "college-age" resident: Minnesota, Illinois, Vermont, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Connecticut, and New Mexico. The average state expenditure for total grants per capita for "college-age" residents is $70, and the median is $50. Six states are expected to spend under $10 per "college-age" resident: Arizona, Hawaii, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, and Wyoming.

Only seven states are expected to spend $100 or more per "college-age" resident on need-based grants to undergraduates--New York, Minnesota, Vermont, Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Iowa. Fourteen states expect to spend under $10 per resident. The average state expenditure for undergraduate need-based grants per "college-age" resident is $51, and the median is $31.

In general, the rankings by entire population and the proportion of the population considered "college-age" yield similar results. A comparison between the per capita need-based grant dollars for the total population and the "college-age" population shows that 25 of the 51 states changed their rankings when the "college-age" population was considered. However, the rankings of 17 of these states changed by just one position, and only three changed by three or more positions: South Carolina went from 18th to 23rd, the District of Columbia from 32nd to 35th, and Utah from 44th to 47th.

Since the proportions of "college-age" residents actually enrolled in postsecondary institutions vary widely among the states, the rankings can be further adjusted by calculating the states' ranks on per capita expenditures per full-time undergraduate students (see Table 23). Full-time undergraduates were used instead of total undergraduate enrollment because about 95 percent of all need-based state grant aid is awarded to students who attend full-time.

The data show that only four states, New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and Minnesota, expect to spend at least $500 per full-time undergraduate for need-based aid. Four states, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Indiana, and Iowa, expect to spend over $300 per full-time undergraduate, but 24 states are expected to spend under $100. The average for all states is $178; the average for the "nation," when all need-based grant dollars are divided by the combined number of full-time undergraduates, is $277, an increase of $30 from last year's report. The median award is $111.

The data for total undergraduate aid show that only five states are expected to spend more than $500 per full-time student. However, the average for all states increased to $237, and the median to $180. Seventeen states expect to spend less than $100 per full-time undergraduate.

A comparison between the per capita rankings for need-based grants to "college-age" populations to the rankings for full-time undergraduates shows that 44 of the 51 states' ranks changed. However, only ten states' rankings changed by more than three positions, which are considered significant differences. Here are the rank orders for states whose ranks changed by more than three positions:

	Rank on "College-Age" Population	Rank on Full-Time Undergraduates
Nevada	51st	44th
Alaska	40th	34th
California	18th	12th
Florida	30th	24th
Colorado	20th	25th
North Dakota	25th	30th
Dist. of Columbia	35th	40th
South Dakota	38th	42nd
Oregon	19th	23rd
Rhode Island	10th	14th

When a state's rank on per capita need-based aid to full-time undergraduates is significantly higher than its rank on per capita aid to "college-age" residents, it is likely that a below-the-national-average proportion of its "college-age" residents are enrolled as full-time undergraduates. Nevada is a good example. When a state's rank on full-time undergraduates is significantly higher than its per capita rank on "college-age" population, it is likely that an above-the-national-average proportion of its "college-age" residents are enrolled full-time. Rhode Island is a good example. These generalizations do not apply to Alaska and the District of Columbia, since so many students from the former enter colleges in other states, and the latter enrolls many students from other states.

Another way of ranking state grant expenditures is by the percentages of full-time undergraduates expected to receive grants, as shown in Table 24. These rankings were calculated by dividing the expected number of need-based award recipients, listed in Table 2 of this report, by the total number of full-time undergraduates, as listed in the last column of Table 23, to get the percentage of full-time undergraduates expected to receive need-based grants. To derive the percentage of undergraduates expected to receive need- and non-need-based awards, the number of expected awards in Tables 2 and 4 were added, and this total was divided by the number of full-time undergraduates.

For the nation, about one out of every five full-time undergraduates should receive a need-based state grant, and nearly one of every four undergraduates should receive some state grant aid in 1992-93. However, there are only seven states where one out of every three undergraduates is expected to receive a need-based grant: Vermont, New York, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Indiana. In only eight states is one out of every three undergraduates expected to receive any state grant--Vermont, New Jersey, New York,

Minnesota, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Indiana. The average percentage of undergraduates expected to receive a need-based grant is 16.4 percent; the average percentage expected to receive any grant is 18.5 percent. In 23 states, fewer than one out of ten students is expected to receive a need-based state grant. And in 20 states fewer than one out of ten students is expected to receive any state grant.

However, the data in Table 24 are not precise, since the percentages in the second column very likely include some full-time undergraduates who received both need- and non-need-based awards. Data on the unduplicated counts of state grant recipients were not available; thus, the percentages in the second column are probably slightly inflated. The percentages are also limited because the numbers of full-time undergraduates include out-of-state students as well as resident students, even though no state makes awards to non-residents. Therefore, a state's particular ranking on either of these two columns would be affected if it enrolled higher-than-average or lower-than-average proportions of students from other states. For example, if a state enrolled many students from other states, its denominator in the calculations would be larger and, therefore, its listed percentage of all undergraduates receiving grants would be an underestimate of the proportion of eligible residents enrolled, relative to other states. Conversely, if a state enrolled few students from other states, its denominator would be smaller, and, therefore, its listed percentage of all eligible undergraduates receiving awards would be an overestimate, relative to other states. Since no data on non-resident undergraduates were available, the data for all undergraduates was used.

The final ranking offered in the report compares states' grant program expenditures in relationship to their total state tax fund appropriations for higher education operating expenses (see Table 25). The relationship is expressed in terms of total state grant dollars as a percentage of state tax fund appropriations. For example, Vermont expects to spend approximately $11,281,000 on need- and non-need-based state grants, and it appropriated about $54,912,000 for higher education operating expenses, so its percentage is 20.54 percent, which ranks second among all the states.

Compared to their appropriations for higher education operating expenses, states spend little for state grant awards. The total amount of state grant funds for the 50 states--the total grant dollars divided by the total amount appropriated for higher education--represented only 6.46 percent of the total appropriations for higher education. The per state average is just 4.80 percent, and the median is only 3.42 percent. In 33 states, total grant awards should represent under 5 percent of the total amount of tax funds appropriated for higher education, with 16 states' grant dollars representing under 2 percent of their total higher education appropriations. Only six states' total grant dollars are expected to represent at least 10 percent of higher education appropriations: New York, 21.48 percent; Vermont, 20.54 percent; Illinois, 13.10 percent; Pennsylvania, 12.48 percent; New Jersey, 10.96 percent; and Iowa, 10.65 percent.

Generally, state rankings on total state grant dollars correspond to state rankings on higher education appropriations; that is, the higher a state ranks in state grant dollars awarded, the higher it is likely to rank on total appropriations. Only three states that rank in the top half of the distribution for total grant dollars awarded also rank in the bottom half of the distribution

for total appropriations: Oklahoma ranks 16th for total grant amounts, versus 27th for total appropriations; Connecticut, 17th versus 29th; and Colorado, 21st versus 28th. Conversely, only four states that rank in the bottom half of the distribution for total state grants also rank in the top half of the distribution for total appropriations: Arizona ranks 41st for total grants, versus 24th for total appropriations; Louisiana, 35th versus 23rd; Alabama, 29th versus 17th; and South Carolina, 26th versus 20th.

When compared to similar data from last year's report, 27 states' grant dollars represented slightly larger proportions of their appropriations to higher education this year than last year. The grant dollars for eight states represented slightly smaller proportions, and the grant dollars for the remaining 15 states represented about the same percentages of their appropriations for higher education.

Here is a comparison of expected changes in total grant dollars and appropriations for higher education in the 50 states:

Both Increased: (25 States)	Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
Both Decreased: (1 State)	Alaska
Appropriations Up, But Grants Down: (1 State)	Louisiana
Grants Up, But Appropriations Stayed the Same: (1 State)	North Dakota
Grants Up, But Appropriations Down: (22 States)	Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Wyoming, Virginia

Between 1991-92 and 1992-93, total state spending for grants increased in 25 of the 26 states (96 percent) where appropriations for higher education increased, but total grant amounts fell in only 1 of the 24 states (4 percent) where appropriations decreased or stayed the same. Therefore, grants and appropriations changed in the same direction in 26 of the 50 states (52 percent). Louisiana increased appropriations but decreased grant dollars, but there were 22 states that increased grants while decreasing appropriations. Recall that many states increased their grants this year to compensate for last year's cuts.

Overall, the combined appropriations for higher education for all 50 states fell by about 1 percent, from approximately $39.7 billion in 1991-92 to $39.4 billion in 1992-93, but the total amount provided for state grants increased by over 8 percent, from $2.37 billion to $2.57 billion. Therefore, while the data show that there is a fairly close relationship between the amounts states spend on grants and their appropriations for higher education, there does not appear to be a strong correlation between changes in states' annual expenditures on grants and higher education appropriations. In fact, the data suggest that a substantial number of states were willing to increase their spending on state grant awards despite decreasing their appropriations for higher education this year.

It is not very surprising that states with larger appropriations for higher education generally spend more on grant dollars, since both reflect a state's willingness and ability to support postsecondary education institutions and students. But neither is it surprising that the relationship between higher education appropriations and state grant expenditures is fairly weak, since the agencies that are responsible for administering grant programs are not the same as those responsible for administering higher education. As separate agencies, they frequently make separate appropriations requests to their state legislatures, and different factors affect the appropriation amounts each agency receives. It can be argued that state grant appropriations should be more closely related to funding for higher education, since the appropriated amounts have a direct effect on tuition charges which, in turn, affect the demand for grant aid. However, the data suggest that the choices states make about funding postsecondary institutions and students are generally unrelated. In the long run, this may benefit state grant recipients, since grants dollars do not appear to have been as adversely affected by the decreases in higher education appropriations.

SECTION

VI

TABLES

TABLE 1

ESTIMATED TOTAL GRANT AID AWARDED
BY STATE PROGRAMS, 1992-93,
BY TYPES OF PROGRAMS
(amounts in millions)

	Need-Based Aid		Non-Need-Based Aid		Other	Total
	Undergrads	Grads	Undergrads	Grads	Aid*	Grants
ALABAMA	$ 2.271	$ 0.042	$ 5.509	$ 0.072	$ 6.289	$ 14.183
ALASKA	0.470		0.025	1.952		2.447
ARIZONA	2.437	0.005				2.442
ARKANSAS	6.319		0.814	0.001	0.170	7.304
CALIFORNIA	151.379	2.266			84.235	237.880
COLORADO	14.812	1.012	8.970	1.143	0.407	26.344
CONNECTICUT	20.805			0.200	15.100	36.105
DELAWARE	1.121	0.209	0.205		0.015	1.550
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1.015	0.053				1.068
FLORIDA	29.628	0.010	46.401	0.300		76.339
GEORGIA	4.951		19.426		1.613	25.990
HAWAII	0.724					0.724
IDAHO	0.580	0.167	0.265			1.012
ILLINOIS	203.532		16.918	1.200	3.491	225.141
INDIANA	55.814		0.377			56.191
IOWA	34.067		0.427	0.365	29.250	64.109
KANSAS	6.894		0.060		0.039	6.993
KENTUCKY	20.520				7.263	27.783
LOUISIANA	5.125		2.541			7.666
MAINE	5.200					5.200
MARYLAND	20.828	0.274	5.681	0.042	0.135	26.960
MASSACHUSETTS	45.989		0.250		12.876	59.115
MICHIGAN	75.469	3.220			4.860	83.549
MINNESOTA	83.170		0.020			83.190
MISSISSIPPI	1.244		0.057	0.050		1.351
MISSOURI	11.097		10.270		0.249	21.616
MONTANA	0.418					0.418
NEBRASKA	2.613					2.613
NEVADA	0.341	0.060				0.401
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1.253		0.010		0.347	1.610
NEW JERSEY	118.868	1.454	8.427	0.225	0.099	129.073
NEW MEXICO	8.295	0.595	0.128	0.007	6.992	16.017
NEW YORK	554.803	9.966	8.185	4.156	0.385	577.495
NORTH CAROLINA	3.163	1.161	24.218		41.864	70.406
NORTH DAKOTA	2.162		0.297			2.459
OHIO	66.000		27.680	0.451		94.131
OKLAHOMA	13.286	1.635	3.959	0.341	21.289	40.510
OREGON	12.606					12.606
PENNSYLVANIA	173.214		0.162			173.376
RHODE ISLAND	9.586				0.337	9.923
SOUTH CAROLINA	17.105				1.210	18.315
SOUTH DAKOTA	0.587	**	0.090			0.677
TENNESSEE	13.723		0.867		9.881	24.471
TEXAS	27.467	2.821			100.932	131.220
UTAH	1.115			0.907	10.534	12.556
VERMONT	11.120	0.151			0.010	11.281
VIRGINIA	6.654		18.921	1.304		26.879
WASHINGTON	23.571				0.999	24.570
WEST VIRGINIA	5.868				9.026	14.894
WISCONSIN	44.216	0.008	1.712		2.008	47.944
WYOMING	0.225					0.225
PUERTO RICO	20.117	2.316			3.000	25.433
Totals	$1,943.837	$27.425	$212.872	$12.716	$374.905	$2,571.755
Percent	75.6%	1.0%	8.3%	0.5%	14.6%	100.0%

* Aid reported under this heading includes grant aid administered by other state agencies, tuition fee waiver programs administered by state and institutions, special programs for veterans, matching programs, etc.

** Reported a grant program for graduate students but could not report dollars awarded. Amounts are included in undergraduate figures for these states.

TABLE 2

DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR COMPREHENSIVE UNDERGRADUATE COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE STATE SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRANT PROGRAMS BASED ON NEED, 1991-92 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1992-93: ACADEMIC YEARS COMPARATIVE DATA REPORT

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
ALABAMA								
Student Assistance Program	6,558	6,580	+ 0.3%	$ 2.183	$ 2.271	+ 4.0%	$ 333	$ 345
ALASKA								
Student Incentive Grants	355	330	- 7.0	0.475	0.470	- 1.1	1,338	1,424
ARIZONA								
Incentive Grant Program - Undergraduates	3,149	3,194	+ 1.4	2.278	2.437	+ 7.0	723	763
ARKANSAS								
Student Assistance Grant	8,182	9,636		3.879	3.984			
Academic Challenge Scholarship	1,013	2,410		0.863	2.335			
All Programs	9,195	12,046	+31.0	4.742	6.319	+33.3	516	525
CALIFORNIA								
Cal Grant A	38,769	39,200		108.487	95.963			
Cal Grant B	31,799	31,950		61.508	53.093			
Cal Grant C	2,651	2,534		2.849	2.314			
Law Enforcement Personnel	7	8		0.008	0.009			
All Programs	73,226	73,692	+ 0.6	172.852	151.379	-12.4	2,361	2,054
COLORADO								
Student Incentive Grants	2,524	3,205		1.734	1.990			
Student Grants	13,674	16,350		10.146	12.295			
Part-Time Student Grant	N/A	N/A		(0.500)	0.500			
Extended Studies Grant	N/A	N/A		N/A	0.027			
All Programs	16,198	19,555	+20.7	12.380	14.812	+19.6	733	731
CONNECTICUT								
Scholastic Achievement Grants	3,900	4,200		2.940	3.150			
Independent College Student Grant Program	3,800	4,000		12.055	12.055			
Aid for Public College Students Grant Program	9,650	10,200		5.600	5.600			
All Programs	17,350	18,400	+ 6.1	20.595	20.805	+ 1.0	1,187	1,131

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
DELAWARE								
Postsecondary Scholarships - Undergraduates	1,165	1,382		0.896	1.100			
Governor's Workforce Development Grant	34	68		0.010	0.021			
All Programs	1,199	1,450	+20.9	0.906	1.121	+23.7	756	773
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
Incentive Grants - Undergraduates	1,053	1,093	+ 3.8	0.978	1.015	+ 3.8	929	929
FLORIDA								
Student Assistance Grants	29,369	33,274		28.828	29.071			
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarships - Undergraduates	18	11		0.072	0.051			
Jose Marti Scholarship Challenge Grant	56	73		0.110	0.146			
M. M. Bethune Scholarship Challenge Grant	93	120		0.269	0.360			
All Programs	29,536	33,478	+13.3	29.279	29.628	+ 1.2	991	885
GEORGIA								
Student Incentive Grant Program	10,787	9,902	- 8.2	5.084	4.951	- 2.6	471	500
HAWAII								
Student Incentive Grants	805	700	-13.0	0.632	0.724	+14.6	785	1,034
IDAHO								
Student Incentive Grants - Undergraduates	1,292	1,596		0.383	0.474			
Minority/At Risk Program	40	40		0.100	0.106			
All Programs	1,332	1,636	+22.8	0.483	0.580	+20.1	363	355
ILLINOIS								
Monetary Award Program	114,600	115,000		183.307	201.932			
Student-to-Student Matching Grants	1,911	2,100		1.446	1.600			
All Programs	116,511	117,100	+ 0.5	184.753	203.532	+10.2	1,586	1,738
INDIANA								
Higher Education/Freedom of Choice Grants	(34,500)	55,846		(50.054)	55.414			
Nursing Scholarship	(400)	(400)		(0.387)	0.400			
All Programs	(34,900)	56,246	+61.2	(50.441)	55.814	+10.7	(1,445)	992
IOWA								
Tuition Grant Program	13,870	14,000		31.120	30.524			
Vo-Tech Tuition Grants	3,850	3,900		1.656	1.647			
Iowa Grant	1,640	1,600		1.575	1.547			
Scholarship Program**	1,487	1,485		0.303	0.349			
All Programs	20,847	20,985	+ 0.7	34.654	34.067	- 1.7	1,662	1,623

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
KANSAS								
State Scholarships	1,034	1,281		0.948	1.235			
Tuition Grants	3,478	3,189		5.442	5.361			
Minority Scholarships	130	205		0.197	0.298			
All Programs	4,642	4,675	+ 0.7	6.587	6.894	+ 4.7	1,419	1,475
KENTUCKY								
College Access Grant Program	18,388	22,000		9.480	12.500			
Tuition Grant Program	6,929	7,400		7.516	8.020			
All Programs	25,317	29,400	+16.1	16.996	20.520	+20.7	671	698
LOUISIANA								
Incentive Grants	3,212	3,200		1.960	2.049			
Tuition Assistance Plan	1,459	1,800		2.486	3.076			
All Programs	4,671	5,000	+ 7.0	4.446	5.125	+15.3	952	1,025
MAINE								
Incentive Grants	8,218	8,500	+ 3.4	5.002	5.200	+ 4.0	609	612
MARYLAND								
General State Scholarships	10,785	12,008		11.490	14.714			
Senatorial Scholarships - Undergraduates	7,778	9,036		4.561	5.912			
Jack T. Tolbert Grants	571	500		0.200	0.200			
Professional Scholarships - Undergraduates	6	6		0.002	0.002			
All Programs	19,140	21,550	+12.6	16.253	20.828	+28.1	849	966
MASSACHUSETTS								
General Scholarship	27,000	32,000		23.040	35.239			
Christian Herter Scholarship	100	100		0.650	0.750			
Cash Grants	0	11,100		0.000	10.000			
All Programs	27,100	43,200	+59.4	23.690	45.989	+94.1	874	1,065
MICHIGAN								
Competitive Scholarships	25,487	25,900		32.822	28.659			
Tuition Grants - Undergraduates	26,007	26,040		42.094	42.780			
Educational Opportunity Grants	(3,000)	(3,000)		(1.100)	1.773			
Adult Part-Time Grants	(6,000)	(6,000)		(2.100)	2.257			
All Programs	60,494	60,940	+ 0.7	78.116	75.469	- 3.4	1,291	1,238
MINNESOTA								
State Grant Program	63,267	(63,267)		77.412	79.000			
Part-Time Grant	3,500	3,500		1.300	1.300			
Rural Nursing Grant	255	255		0.099	0.120			
Dislocated Rural Workers Program	437	437		0.210	0.250			
Non-AFDC Child Care Grant	1,260	1,260		2.301	2.500			
All Programs	68,719	68,719	N.C.	81.322	83.170	+ 2.3	1,183	1,210

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
MISSISSIPPI								
Student Incentive Grants	1,863	2,051	+10.1	1.131	1.244	+10.0	607	607
MISSOURI								
Student Grants	8,277	8,500	+ 2.7	10.142	11.097	+ 9.4	1,225	1,306
MONTANA								
Incentive Grants	1,102	600	-45.6	0.414	0.418	+ 1.0	376	697
NEBRASKA								
State Scholarship Award Program	3,631	3,600		1.359	1.402			
Scholarship Assistance Program	2,522	2,500		0.886	0.886			
Postsecondary Education Award Program	251	250		0.125	0.325			
All Programs	6,404	6,350	- 0.8	2.370	2.613	+10.3	370	411
NEVADA								
Student Incentive Grants - Undergraduates	584	581	- 0.5	0.326	0.341	+ 4.6	558	587
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
Incentive Grants	1,495	1,500		0.785	1.213			
Nursing Education Grants	105	105		0.040	0.040			
All Programs	1,600	1,605	+ 0.3	0.825	1.253	+51.9	516	781
NEW JERSEY								
Tuition Aid Grants	49,118	55,000		89.323	106.687			
Educational Opportunity Fund - Undergraduates	12,923	12,179		10.595	11.781			
Part-Time Tuition Aid Grants	435	400		0.302	0.400			
All Programs	62,476	67,579	+ 8.2	100.220	118.868	+18.6	1,604	1,759
NEW MEXICO								
Incentive Grants	(8,000)	(8,000)		(5.647)	5.983			
Student Choice	(360)	(360)		(0.545)	0.545			
Scholars Program	(445)	(445)		(1.101)	1.267			
Child Care Grant	0	N/A		0.000	0.500			
All Programs	(8,805)	(8,805)	N.C.	(7.293)	8.295	+13.7	828	942
NEW YORK								
Tuition Assistance Program - Undergraduates	274,701	275,887		493.207	543.673			
Aid for Part-Time Study	21,499	(21,499)		10.988	11.130			
All Programs	296,200	297,386	+ 0.4	504.195	554.803	+10.0	1,702	1,866
NORTH CAROLINA								
Student Incentive Grants	3,038	3,100	+ 2.0	2.908	3.163	+ 8.8	957	1,020
NORTH DAKOTA								
Student Financial Assistance Program	2,631	3,602	+36.9	1.475	2.162	+46.6	561	600

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
OHIO								
Instructional Grants	78,560	95,400	+21.4	57.275	66.000	+15.2	729	692
OKLAHOMA								
Tuition Aid Grants - Undergraduates	16,791	16,595		12.561	13.231			
William P. Willis Scholarship Program	26	26		0.051	0.055			
All Programs	16,817	16,621	- 1.2	12.612	13.286	+ 5.3	750	799
OREGON								
Need Grants	15,173	15,450		11.356	12.048			
Cash Awards	804	675		0.667	0.558			
All Programs	15,977	16,125	+ 0.9	12.023	12.606	+ 4.8	753	782
PENNSYLVANIA								
State Grants	126,113	126,750		158.090	173.213			
POW/MIA Program	3	1		0.002	0.001			
All Programs	126,116	126,751	+ 0.5	158.092	173.214	+ 9.6	1,254	1,367
RHODE ISLAND								
Scholarship and Grant Program	10,786	13,500	+25.2	9.141	9.586	+ 4.9	847	710
SOUTH CAROLINA								
Tuition Grants	6,694	6,312	- 5.7	16.800	17.105	+ 1.8	2,510	2,710
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Incentive Grants - Undergraduates*	910	900		0.330	0.396			
Tuition Equalization Grants	674	700		0.150	0.191			
All Programs	1,584	1,600	+ 1.0	0.480	0.587	+22.3	303	367
TENNESSEE								
Student Assistance Awards	18,228	19,500	+ 7.0	12.793	13.723	+ 7.3	702	704
TEXAS								
Tuition Equalization Grants - Undergraduates	15,964	15,840		23.723	23.760			
Public Educational SSIG Grants - Undergraduates	4,703	4,704		2.787	2.880			
State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment - Undergraduates	455	455		0.361	0.360			
Tax Reimbursement Grants	65	65		0.050	0.050			
Nursing Scholarships - Undergraduates	258	225		0.464	0.417			
All Programs	21,445	21,289	- 0.7	27.385	27.467	+ 0.3	1,277	1,290
UTAH								
Incentive Grants	2,276	2,200	- 3.3	1.034	1.115	+ 7.8	454	507
VERMONT								
Incentive Grants - Undergraduates	8,293	9,086		9.968	9.934			
Part-Time Student Grants	1,814	2,512		0.686	0.802			

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
VERMONT (cont.)								
Non-Degree Student Grant Program	1,251	1,231		0.365	0.384			
All Programs	11,358	12,829	+13.0	11.019	11.120	+ 0.9	970	867
VIRGINIA								
College Scholarship Assistance Program	7,660	8,100		4.298	5.654			
Undergraduate Student Financial Assistance Program	625	800		0.594	1.000			
All Programs	8,285	8,900	+ 7.4	4.892	6.654	+36.0	590	748
WASHINGTON								
State Need Grants	22,929	19,860		22.603	22.516			
Assistance to Blind Students	2	3		0.001	0.002			
Educational Opportunity Grant	416	448		0.923	1.053			
All Programs	23,347	20,311	-13.0	23.527	23.571	+ 0.2	1,008	1,161
WEST VIRGINIA								
Higher Education Grant Program	5,450	5,032	- 7.7	5.781	5.868	+ 1.5	1,061	1,166
WISCONSIN								
Tuition Grants	8,683	8,700		14.176	14.839			
Higher Education Grants	36,687	37,000		20.888	21.840			
Indian Student Grants - Undergraduates	987	995		1.499	1.552			
Handicapped Student Grants	80	85		0.113	0.124			
Talent Incentive Grants	4,919	5,000		4.815	4.969			
Private School Student Minority Grants	337	350		0.430	0.460			
Vo-Tech Student Minority Grants	232	250		0.211	0.232			
Independent Student Grants	149	150		0.192	0.200			
All Programs	52,074	52,530	+ 0.9	42.324	44.216	+ 4.5	813	842
WYOMING								
Incentive Grants	592	(592)	N.C.	0.216	0.225	+ 4.2	365	380
PUERTO RICO								
Supplementary Assistance Pgm - Undergrads	26,644	(26,644)		1.463	3.944			
Educational Fund - Undergraduates	23,555	(23,555)		6.664	7.546			
Legislative Awards - Undergraduates	14,864	(14,864)		7.180	7.340			
Student Incentive Grants	3,421	(3,421)		1.181	1.287			
All Programs	68,484	(68,484)	N.C.	16.488	20.117	+22.0	241	294
Grand Totals:								
Need-Based Undergraduate Aid	1,422,355	1,506,506	+ 5.9%	$1,798.308	$1,943.837	+ 8.1%	$1,264	$1,290

* Data could not be broken down into graduate versus undergraduate categories. Therefore, all data is listed under undergraduate category.

** Portion of these awards can be made without regard to need.

Figures in ( ) are 1991-92 data from last year's report or 1992-93 data not available.

TABLE 3

DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR COMPREHENSIVE NEED-BASED AID PROGRAMS
FOR GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL STUDENTS,
ACTUAL 1991-92 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1992-93

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
ALABAMA								
Chiropractic Scholarships	17	18	+ 5.9%	$ 0.038	$ 0.042	+ 10.5%	$2,235	$ 2,333
ARIZONA								
Incentive Grant Program - Graduates	6	6	N.C.	0.005	0.005	N.C.	833	833
CALIFORNIA								
Graduate Fellowships	710	710	N.C.	2.673	2.266	- 15.2	3,765	3,192
COLORADO								
Graduate Grants	874	901	+ 3.1	1.012	1.012	N.C.	1,158	1,123
DELAWARE								
Postsecondary Scholarships - Graduates	174	206	+18.4	0.171	0.209	+ 22.2	983	1,015
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
Incentive Grants - Graduates	55	57	+ 3.6	0.051	0.053	+ 3.9	927	930
FLORIDA								
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarships - Graduates	2	1	-50.0	0.014	0.010	- 28.6	7,000	10,000
IDAHO								
Student Incentive Grants - Graduates	246	304	+23.6	0.134	0.167	+ 24.6	545	549
MARYLAND								
Senatorial Scholarships - Graduates	208	241		0.103	0.133			
Professional Scholarships - Graduates	351	350		0.146	0.141			
All Programs	559	591	+ 5.7	0.249	0.274	+ 10.0	445	464
MICHIGAN								
Tuition Grants - Graduates	1,958	1,960	+ 0.1	3.168	3.220	+ 1.6	1,618	1,643
NEVADA								
Student Incentive Grants - Graduates	119	119	N.C.	0.058	0.060	+ 3.4	487	504
NEW JERSEY								
Educational Opportunity Fund - Graduates	194	214		0.670	0.652			
Martin L. King Physician-Dentist Schlshp	60	60		0.602	0.602			
C. Clyde Ferguson Law Scholarship	30	30		0.200	0.200			
All Programs	284	304	+ 7.0	1.472	1.454	- 1.2	5,183	4,783
NEW MEXICO								
Graduate Fellowships	(100)	(100)	N.C.	(0.595)	0.595	N.C.	(5,950)	5,950

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
NEW YORK								
Tuition Assistance Program - Graduates	11,744	11,795	+ 0.4	9.040	9.966	+ 10.2	770	845
NORTH CAROLINA								
Board of Governors Medical Scholarships	82	85		0.805	0.876			
Board of Governors Dental Scholarships	29	30		0.281	0.285			
All Programs	111	115	+ 3.6	1.086	1.161	+ 6.9	9,784	10,096
OKLAHOMA								
Tuition Aid Grants - Graduates	1,928	1,905	- 1.2	1.552	1.635	+ 5.3	805	858
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Incentive Grants - Graduates*	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A
TEXAS								
Tuition Equalization Grants - Graduates	2,177	2,160		2.636	2.640			
Public Educational SSIG Grants - Graduates	96	96		0.116	0.120			
Nursing Scholarships - Graduates	29	25		0.052	0.046			
State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment - Graduates	9	9		0.015	0.015			
All Programs	2,311	2,290	- 0.9	2.819	2.821	+ 0.1	1,220	1,232
VERMONT								
Incentive Grants - Graduates	67	73	+ 9.0	0.152	0.151	- 0.7	2,269	2,068
WISCONSIN								
Indian Student Grants - Graduates	5	5	N.C.	0.008	0.008	N.C.	1,600	1,600
PUERTO RICO								
Supplementary Assistance Pgm - Graduates	544	(544)		0.688	1.856			
Educational Fund - Graduates	238	(238)		0.136	0.154			
Legislative Awards - Graduates	619	(619)		0.299	0.306			
All Programs	1,401	(1,401)	N.C.	1.123	2.316	+106.2	802	1,653
Grand Totals:								
Need-Based Graduate Aid	22,671	22,861	+ 0.8%	$25.420	$27.425	+ 7.9%	$1,121	$ 1,200

* Data could not be broken down into graduate versus undergraduate categories. Therefore, all data is listed under undergraduate category.

Figures in ( ) are 1991-92 data from last year's survey or 1992-93 data not available.

TABLE 4

DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR NON-NEED-BASED STATE PROGRAMS
FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS,
ACTUAL 1991-92 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1992-93

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
ALABAMA								
Student Grants Program	6,276	6,200		$ 3.981	$ 4.517			
National Guard Education Assistance Program - Undergraduates	590	578		0.160	0.156			
Emergency Secondary Education Scholarship Program - Undergraduates	245	235		0.829	0.797			
Police Officer's and Firefighter's Survivor's Education Assistance Program	19	20		0.045	0.039			
All Programs	7,130	7,033	- 1.4%	5.015	5.509	+ 9.9%	$ 703	$ 783
ALASKA								
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) - Undergraduates	(4)	4	N.C.	0.029	0.025	- 13.8	7,250	6,250
ARKANSAS								
Governor's Scholars Program	353	375		0.674	0.750			
MIA/KIA Dependents Scholarship - Undergraduates	13	14		0.033	0.034			
Law Enforcement Officers' Dependents Scholarship	9	10		0.015	0.020			
Second Effort Scholarship	0	10		0.000	0.010			
All Programs	375	409	+ 9.1	0.722	0.814	+ 12.7	1,925	1,990
COLORADO								
Undergraduate Merit Awards	11,229	11,896	+ 5.9	8.197	8.970	+ 9.4	730	754
DELAWARE								
Educational Benefits for Children of Deceased Military and Police	5	2		0.025	0.004			
Diamond State Scholarships	166	171		0.164	0.171			
Bradford Barnes Scholarship	3	4		0.021	0.030			
All Programs	174	177	+ 1.7	0.210	0.205	- 2.4	1,207	1,158
FLORIDA								
Tuition Voucher Fund	16,987	17,946		16.589	16.574			
Undergraduate Scholars' Fund	9,778	11,824		23.012	25.017			

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
FLORIDA (cont.)								
Scholarships for Children of Deceased/Disabled Veteran/POW/MIA	59	85		0.062	0.102			
Confederate Memorial Scholarships	18	22		0.003	0.003			
Exceptional Student Education State Training Grant	398	400		0.119	0.100			
Critical Teachers Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program	1,826	712		0.692	0.348			
Challenger Astronauts Memorial Scholarships	54	65		0.170	0.253			
Vocational Gold Seal Endorsement Scholarships	934	2,241		1.757	4.004			
All Programs	30,054	33,295	+10.8	42.404	46.401	+ 9.4	1,411	1,394
GEORGIA								
Tuition Equalization Grants	16,548	16,924		13.140	16.924			
Law Enforcement Personnel Dependents Grants	19	19		0.033	0.038			
Governor's Scholarship Program	944	1,544		1.290	2.379			
North Georgia College/ROTC Grants	244	283		0.073	0.085			
All Programs	17,755	18,770	+ 5.7	14.536	19.426	+ 33.6	819	1,035
IDAHO								
State of Idaho Scholarships	100	100	N.C.	0.252	0.265	+ 5.2	2,520	2,650
ILLINOIS								
National Guard Scholarships	5,000	5,000		3.536	3.800			
Descendants Grants	42	42		0.076	0.092			
Merit Recognition Scholarships	4,000	2,300		3.939	2.200			
Veteran Grants - Undergraduates	13,500	14,040		10.260	10.800			
College Bond Incentive Grant	41	400		0.003	0.026			
All Programs	22,583	21,782	- 3.5	17.814	16.918	- 5.0	789	777
INDIANA								
Hoosier Scholarships	(794)	(794)	N.C.	(0.397)	0.377	- 5.0	(500)	475
IOWA								
Scholarship Program*	1,815	1,815	N.C.	0.370	0.427	+ 15.4	204	235
KANSAS								
Vocational Scholarship Program	95	120	+26.3	0.033	0.060	+ 81.8	347	500
LOUISIANA								
T. H. Harris Scholarships	1,782	1,754		0.692	0.702			
Honors Scholarship	0	1,021		0.000	1.839			
All Programs	1,782	2,775	+55.7	0.692	2.541	+267.2	388	916

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
MARYLAND								
Edward T. Conroy Memorial Program	60	74		0.111	0.108			
Delegate Scholarships - Undergraduates	1,894	1,950		1.263	1.478			
Distinguished Scholar Program	1,380	1,378		4.046	4.095			
All Programs	3,334	3,402	+ 2.0	5.420	5.681	+ 4.8	1,626	1,670
MASSACHUSETTS								
Public Service Grant	150	150	N.C.	0.250	0.250	N.C.	1,667	1,667
MINNESOTA								
Safety Officers Survivor Grant	10	10	N.C.	0.019	0.020	+ 5.3	1,900	2,000
MISSISSIPPI								
POW/MIA/Law/Fireman Scholarship	14	23	+64.3	0.040	0.057	+ 42.5	2,857	2,478
MISSOURI								
Higher Education Academic Scholarships	5,145	5,125		9.897	10.250			
Public Service Officer or Employee's Child Survivor Grant Program	12	12		0.018	0.020			
All Programs	5,157	5,137	- 0.4	9.915	10.270	+ 3.6	1,923	1,999
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
War Orphans Scholarships	7	10	+42.9	0.007	0.010	+ 42.9	1,000	1,000
NEW JERSEY								
Public Tuition Benefits	24	38		0.036	0.065			
Edward J. Bloustein Distinguished Scholars Program	3,773	4,000		3.693	4.000			
Garden State Scholarships	5,216	5,124		2.735	2.562			
Garden State Urban Scholars Program	1,717	1,800		1.644	1.800			
All Programs	10,730	10,962	+ 2.2	8.108	8.427	+ 3.9	756	769
NEW MEXICO								
Vietnam Veterans Scholarships - Undergrads	(58)	N/A	N/A	(0.038)	0.128	+236.8	(655)	N/A
NEW YORK								
Children of Veterans Awards	618	750		0.246	0.338			
Memorial Scholarships for Children of Deceased Police Officers & Firefighters	71	80		0.393	0.525			
Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarships - Undergraduates	317	360		1.262	1.691			
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Awards	599	700		0.668	3.000			
Empire State Scholarships of Excellence	1,122	923		1.955	0.908			
Police Officer/Firefighter/ Corrections Officer Awards	4	15		0.002	0.007			

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
NEW YORK (cont.)								
Health Services Corps - Undergraduates	164	236		2.109	1.716			
All Programs	2,895	3,064	+ 5.8	6.635	8.185	+ 23.4	2,292	2,671
NORTH CAROLINA								
Legislative Tuition Grants	26,259	22,200	-15.5	24.285	24.218	- 0.3	925	1,091
NORTH DAKOTA								
Scholars Program	N/A	N/A		(0.324)	0.297	- 8.3	N/A	N/A
OHIO								
Academic Scholarship Program	3,769	3,700		3.688	3.700			
War Orphans Scholarship Program	977	1,031		2.256	2.659			
Student Choice Grants	40,124	40,341		18.100	21.211			
Scholarships for Children of Deceased Police Officers and Firefighters	42	45		0.103	0.110			
All Programs	44,912	45,117	+ 0.5	24.147	27.680	+ 14.6	538	614
OKLAHOMA								
Future Teachers Scholarship Program - Undergraduates	207	198		0.176	0.178			
Academic Scholars Program - Undergraduates	827	995		3.781	3.781			
All Programs	1,034	1,193	+15.4	3.957	3.959	+ 0.1	3,827	3,319
PENNSYLVANIA								
Scholars in Education Awards	191	117	-38.7	0.520	0.162	- 68.8	2,723	1,385
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Superior Scholar Scholarship	63	60	- 4.8	0.090	0.090	N.C.	1,429	1,500
TENNESSEE								
Academic Scholars Program	136	169		0.524	0.845			
Community Colleges Program	11	8		0.020	0.016			
Dependent Children Scholarship	1	1		0.003	0.006			
All Programs	148	178	+20.3	0.547	0.867	+ 58.5	3,696	4,871
VIRGINIA								
Tuition Assistance Grant Program - Undergraduates	11,954	11,997		16.302	17.326			
Eastern Shore Assistance Program	29	40		0.035	0.043			
Virginia Scholars Program	181	189		0.541	0.552			
Virginia Transfer Grant	746	600		1.070	1.000			
All Programs	12,910	12,826	- 0.7	17.948	18.921	+ 5.4	1,390	1,475

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
WISCONSIN								
Academic Excellence Scholarship	1,098	1,550	+41.2	1.113	1.712	+ 53.8	1,014	1,105
Grand Totals:								
Non-Need-Based Undergraduate Aid	202,860	204,969	+ 1.0%	$194.034	$212.872	+ 9.7%	$ 956	$1,039

* Portion of these awards are made with regard to need.

Figures in ( ) are 1991-92 data from last year's survey or 1992-93 data not available.

TABLE 5

DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR NON-NEED-BASED STATE PROGRAMS
FOR GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL STUDENTS,
ACTUAL 1991-92 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1992-93

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
ALABAMA								
National Guard Education Assistance Program - Graduates	66	64		$ 0.022	$ 0.021			
Emergency Secondary Education Scholarship Program - Graduates	16	15		0.053	0.051			
All Programs	82	79	- 3.7%	0.075	0.072	- 4.0%	$ 915	$ 911
ALASKA								
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) - Graduates	(52)	52		0.923	0.794			
WAMI Medical Exchange Program	29	29		1.208	1.158			
All Programs	81	81	N.C.	2.131	1.952	- 8.4	26,309	24,099
ARKANSAS								
MIA/KIA Dependents Scholarship - Graduates	1	1	N.C.	0.001	0.001	N.C.	1,000	1,000
COLORADO								
Graduate Fellowship	643	636	- 1.1	1.143	1.143	N.C.	1,778	1,797
CONNECTICUT								
High Technology Graduate Scholarship Program	20	20	N.C.	0.195	0.200	+ 2.6	9,750	10,000
FLORIDA								
Regents Scholarships	1	1		0.005	0.005			
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	62	60		0.284	0.275			
Graduate Scholars' Fund	38	1		0.360	0.010			
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Student Member Scholarship	1	1		0.005	0.005			
State Board of Community Colleges Student Member Scholarship	1	1		0.005	0.005			
All Programs	103	64	-37.9	0.659	0.300	- 54.5	6,398	4,688
ILLINOIS								
Veteran Grants - Graduates	1,500	1,560	+ 4.0	1.140	1.200	+ 5.3	760	769

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
IOWA								
Osteopathic Grant Program	70	110		0.201	0.292			
Graduate Assistance Grant	N/A	N/A		(0.074)	0.073			
All Programs	70	110	+57.1	0.275	0.365	+ 32.7	2,871	2,655
MARYLAND								
Delegate Scholarships - Graduates	41	42		0.035	0.041			
Edward T. Conroy Memorial Program	1	1		0.001	0.001			
All Programs	42	43	+ 2.4	0.036	0.042	+ 16.7	857	977
MISSISSIPPI								
Public Management Graduate Intern Program	13	10	-23.1	0.051	0.050	- 2.0	3,923	5,000
NEW JERSEY								
Garden State Graduate Fellowship	39	30	-23.1	0.254	0.225	- 11.4	6,513	7,500
NEW MEXICO								
Vietnam Veterans Scholarships - Graduates	(2)	N/A	N/A	(0.002)	0.007	+250.0	(1,000)	N/A
NEW YORK								
Lehman Fellowships	8	20		0.028	0.100			
Regents Health Care Opportunity Scholarships	190	250		1.800	2.410			
Health Services Corps - Graduates	97	139		1.292	1.052			
Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarships - Graduates	106	120		0.444	0.594			
All Programs	401	529	+31.9	3.564	4.156	+ 16.6	8,888	7,856
OHIO								
Regents Graduate/Professional Fellowships	112	134	+19.6	0.377	0.451	+ 19.6	3,366	3,366
OKLAHOMA								
Chiropractic Education Assistance Program	24	60		0.055	0.050			
Minority Doctoral Study Grants	29	30		0.112	0.120			
Minority Professional Study Grants	21	25		0.125	0.150			
Academic Scholars Program - Graduates	4	5		0.019	0.019			
Future Teachers Scholarship Program - Graduates	2	2		0.002	0.002			
All Programs	80	122	+52.5	0.313	0.341	+ 8.9	3,913	2,795
UTAH								
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)	65	60	- 7.7	0.906	0.907	+ 0.1	13,938	15,117

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards 1991-92	Number of Monetary Awards 1992-93	Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1991-92	Payout Dollars (Millions) 1992-93	Percentage Change	Average Award Amount 1991-92	Average Award Amount 1992-93
VIRGINIA								
Tuition Assistance Grant Program - Graduates	900	903	+ 0.3	1.227	1.304	+ 6.3	1,363	1,444
Grand Totals:								
Non-Need-Based Graduate Aid	4,154	4,382	+ 5.5%	$12.349	$12.716	+ 3.0%	$ 2,973	$ 2,902

Figures in ( ) are 1991-92 data from last year's survey or 1992-93 data not available.

TABLE 6

OTHER PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE AGENCY

State/Program	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
ALABAMA								
Guaranteed Student Loan Program	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		$90,000,000	35,000
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$243,012*	Und/Grad	X		X		$243,012	61
Appalachian Youth Scholarship	$25,000	Und	X		X		$25,000	15
ALASKA								
Student Loan Program		Und/Grad		X		X	$55,000,000	14,500
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$39,831*	Und	X			X	$44,550	9
ARIZONA								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$220,437*	Und	X			X	$227,325	86
ARKANSAS								
Emergency Secondary Education Loan	$81,717	Und/Grad	X			X	$81,717	37
Teacher and Administrator Grant Program	$179,544	Grad		X		X	$170,000	775
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$146,183*	Und/Grad	X			X	$144,916	31
Faculty/Administrator Development Fellows	$21,350	Grad				X	$21,350	1
CALIFORNIA								
California Loan Programs	$25,118,000	Und/Grad						
Stafford Loans	(included in CLP)	Und/Grad		X	X		$987,500,000	304,408
PLUS/SLS	(included in CLP)	Und/Grad		X		X	$323,183,000	101,534
Assumption Program of Loans for Education	$1,800,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$1,600,000	660
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$1,014,000*	Und	X			X	$1,014,000	676
Work-Study	$607,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$607,000	N/A
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship Program	$1,954,532*	Und/Grad	X			X	$1,954,532	397
COLORADO								
Work-Study	$9,872,181	Und		X	X		$9,872,408	7,384
Nursing Scholarship	$220,800	Und/Grad	X			X	$221,192	172
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$198,134*	Und/Grad	X			X	$200,000	40
NDSL Loan Match	$283,033	Und		X	X		$283,416	241
CONNECTICUT								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$197,697*	Und	X			X	$228,000	46
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$113,950*	Und	X			X	$96,000	64
DELAWARE								
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Loan	$170,000	Und	X			X	$157,000	71
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$40,065*	Und	X			X	$40,000	8
Optometric Institutional Aid	$32,000	Grad		X		X	$16,000	4
Robert C. Byrd Scholarship	$22,500*	Und	X			X	$22,500	15
Nursing Incentive Loan	$150,000	Und	X			X	$97,400	39

State/Program	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$36,501*	Und	X		X		$35,000	7
Nurses Training Corps Program	$250,000	Und	X		X		$250,000	17
FLORIDA								
Most Promising Teacher Scholarship/Loan	$3,204,000	Und	X			X	$3,204,000	856
Student Loan Forgiveness	$1,440,000	N/A		X		X	$1,440,000	647
Public School Work Experience Program	$64,285	Und	X			X	$64,285	50
College Career Work Experience Program	$534,958	Und		X	X		$534,958	280
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$387,000*	Und	X			X	$387,000	258
Teacher Scholarship Loan Program	$1,170,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$1,170,000	325
Masters' Fellowship Loan for Teachers	$232,800	Grad	X			X	$232,800	23
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarships	$778,124*	Und/Grad	X			X	$778,124	156
GEORGIA								
Osteopathic Cancel!able Medical Loan	$160,000	Grad	X		X		$160,000	16
N. Georgia College Cancellable Military Loan	$501,740	Und/Grad	X			X	$501,720	120
Critical Fields Cancellable Loan (GSL)	$2,390,000	Und/Grad	X	(some instances)		X	$2,660,000	1,330
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$389,618*	Und/Grad	X			X	$400,00	80
IDAHO								
Work-Study	$810,000	Und		X	X		$810,000	934
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$60,549*	Und	X			X	$70,000	14
Fowler Memorial Scholarship	$6,413	Und	X			X	$7,085	5
Education Incentive Loan Forgiveness	$54,400	Und	X			X	$54,400	28
ILLINOIS								
Stafford Loan Program	Revolving fund for defaulted loans	Und/Grad		X	X			
SLS	Revolving fund for defaulted loans	Und/Grad		X		X		
PLUS	Revolving fund for defaulted loans	Und/Grad		X		X		
Uniloan	Revolving fund for defaulted loans	Und/Grad		X		X		
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$700,000*	Und	X			X	$700,000	150
Minority Teachers Scholarship	$500,000	Und	X			X	$500,000	125
INDIANA								
State Summer Work-Study				X	X			
Minority Teacher Scholarship	$500,000	Und				X	N/A	N/A
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$426,000*	Und			X		N/A	N/A
Lilly Endowment Educational Awards	$8,904,893	Und			X		N/A	N/A
IOWA								
Stafford Loan	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		$202,201,338	84,000
PLUS/SLS Loan	N/A	Und/Grad		X		X	$55,806,848	29,680

State/Program	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
IOWA (cont.)								
College Work-Study	$2,898,840	Und/Grad		X	X		$2,898,840	5,000
Osteopathic Forgivable Loan	$379,260	Grad		X		X	$291,500	110
KANSAS								
Osteopathic Loan	$500,000	Grad		X	X		$500,000	50
Teacher Scholarship	$491,931	Und	X			X	$508,764	104
Nursing Student Scholarship	$672,772	Und		X		X	$897,000	299
Optometry Loan Program	$116,200	Grad	X			X	$116,200	35
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$149,008*	Und	X			X	$150,000	31
College Work-Study	$463,729	Und		X		X	$463,729	300
Youth Education Services	$39,303	Und		X		X	$39,303	30
KENTUCKY								
Stafford Loan Program	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		$101,310,700	43,600
PLUS/SLS	N/A	Und/Grad		X		X	$15,081,900	5,300
Teacher Scholarship	$1,575,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$1,575,000	375
Work-Study	$1,000,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$880,000	1,000
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$228,281*	Und	X			X	$228,281	47
Consolidation Loans	N/A	Und/Grad		X		X	$3,000,000	90
LOUISIANA								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$255,531*	Und/Grad	X			X	$255,531	51
Stafford Loan/LA-OP		Und/Grad		X	X (SLS)	(PLUS)	$100,100,742	38,500
PLUS/SLS		Und/Grad		X	X	X	$11,001,200	4,200
Consolidation		Und/Grad		X		X	$6,000,400	398
Rockefeller Scholarship	$60,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$60,000	66
MAINE								
Osteopathic Loan Fund	$127,999	Grad	X			X		
Postgraduate Health Professions Program	$1,205,297	Grad	X			X		
Blaine House Scholars	$1,700,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$1,800,000	1,200
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$70,000*	Und	X			X	$22,500	15
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$50,000*	Und	X			X	$50,000	29
MARYLAND								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship		Und/Grad	X			X	$287,571	52
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Education Tuition Assistance	$205,656	Und/Grad	X			X	$205,546	46
Loan Assistance Repayment Program	$170,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$170,000	64
Tuition Reimbursement for Firemen, Ambulance and Rescue Squad Members	$135,135	Und/Grad		X		X	$135,135	160

State/Program	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
MARYLAND (cont.)								
Nursing Scholarships	$544,100	Und/Grad	X			X	$544,100	227
Nursing Living Expenses Grant	$47,200	Und/Grad		X	X		$47,200	80
Physical and Occupational Therapy	$80,000	Und		X		X	$15,000	8
Child Care Provider	$100,000	Und	X			X	$53,250	47
Distinguished Scholarship Teacher Education	$150,000	Und	X			X	$145,500	49
Family Practice Medical Scholarship	$45,000	Grad	X		X		$60,000	8
MASSACHUSETTS								
Gilbert Matching Grant Program	$3,000,000	Und		X	X		$3,000,000	3,000
Tuition Waiver for Public Institutions	$9,876,186	Und		X	X		$9,876,186	11,100
No Interest Loan Program	$9,000,000	Und		X	X		$9,000,000	3,000
MICHIGAN								
Federal Family Education Loans	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		$330,000,000	140,000
Work-Study	$6,231,870	Und/Grad		X	X		$6,000,000	6,100
Degree Reimbursement	$9,168,320	Und/Grad		X		X	$9,100,000	9,800
Michigan Loan Program	N/A	Und/Grad		X		X	$5,000,000	1,000
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$358,075*	Und	X			X	$349,500	233
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$559,046*	Und	X			X	$605,000	121
Indian Tuition Waiver	$2,265,681	Und/Grad		X		X	$1,900,000	2,000
MINNESOTA								
Work-Study	$5,869,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$5,800,000	6,800
Student Educational Loan Fund (SELF)	Financed by bond sales	Und/Grad		X		X	$37,000,000	14,000
MISSISSIPPI								
Medical Education Loan/Scholarship Program	Revolving funds	Grad	X			X	$126,000	21
Academic Common Market	$0	Und/Grad	X			X	N/A	200
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$154,761*	Und	X		X		$154,761	35
Special Nursing Education Loan/Scholarship	$148,540	Und	X		X		$72,000	36
William Winter Teacher Scholar Program	$245,500	Und	X			X	$245,500	93
Stafford/SLS	$340,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$340,000	50
Graduate and Professional Degree Loan/Scholarship Program	$110,542	Grad	X			X	$110,542	18
Southern Regional Education Board Loan/Scholarship Program	$205,800	Grad	X			X	$205,800	33
Dental Education Loan/Scholarship Program	Revolving funds	Grad	X			X	$52,000	13
African-American Doctoral Teacher Scholarship	$50,000	Grad	X			X	$50,000	5
Career Ladder Nursing Loan/Scholarship Program	$30,000	Und	X			X	$28,500	19
Health Care Professions Scholarship/Loan	$4,500	Und	X			X	$6,000	4
Nursing Education Loan/Scholarship Program	$176,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$176,000	55

State/Program	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
MISSOURI								
Stafford Student Loan	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		$15,000,000	48,550
PLUS	N/A	Und		X	X		$8,000,000	2,450
SLS	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		$12,500,000	4,500
MONTANA								
Work-Study	$496,790	Und/Grad	X (70%)		X (30%)		$496,790	552
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
Medical Education Capitation and Loan	$200,000	N/A		X		X	$200,000	10
Veterinary Education Capitation and Loan	$163,000	N/A		X		X	$163,000	13
Optometry Education Capitation and Loan	$18,000	N/A		X		X	$18,000	7
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$66,714*	Und/Grad				X	$64,303	13
NEW JERSEY								
Stafford Loan	$0	Und/Grad		X	X		$210,000,000	70,000
PLUS	$0	Und/Grad		X		X	$20,000,000	6,000
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$504,750*	Und	X			X	$504,750	104
SLS	$0	Und/Grad		X		X	$30,000,000	8,000
NJCLASS Loan	$0	Und/Grad		X		X	$25,000,000	5,000
NEW MEXICO								
Work-Study	$3,761,800	Und/Grad		X	X (33%)		$3,670,920	3,240
Osteopathic Student Loan	$50,000	Grad		X	X		$132,000	11
Nursing Student Loan	$274,200	Und/Grad		X	X		$410,000	164
Physician Student Loan	$200,000	Grad		X	X		$360,000	30
Minority Doctoral Assistant Student Loan	$300,000	Grad	X			X	$100,000	4
Minority Teachers Program	$200,000	Und			X		N/A	N/A
NEW YORK								
Stafford Loan Program	$0	Und/Grad		X	X		$785,497,564	269,789
PLUS	$0	Und		X	X		$74,290,400	22,515
SLS	$0	Und/Grad		X	X		$150,135,826	54,496
Loan Forgiveness Program	$1,600,000	Grad		X		X	$1,600,000	80
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$1,081,997*	Und	X			X	$1,081,997	225
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$605,350*	Und	X			X	$605,350	370
Loan Repayment Program	$300,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$300,000	20
Transit Corps of Engineers	$300,000	Und/Grad	X			X	N/A	N/A
NORTH CAROLINA								
Health, Science and Math Scholarship/Loan	$2,600,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$2,600,000	450
Nurse Education Scholarship/Loan	$1,050,000	Und		X	X		$1,050,000	950
Nurse Scholars	$3,276,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$3,276,000	909
OKLAHOMA								
Stafford Guaranteed Student Loan	$0	Und/Grad		X	X		$116,423,363	32,749
State Regents' Fee Waiver	$0	Und/Grad	X		X		$21,289,157	N/A
PLUS/SLS	$0	Und/Grad		X	X		$36,896,379	9,737
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarships	$189,184*	Und/Grad	X			X	$201,589	43

State/Program	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
OREGON								
Medical/Dental Student Loan	$0	Grad		X	X		$850,000	240
Teacher Corps Loan	$5,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$7,998	5
Nursing Loan	$50,000	Und	X		X		$48,000	32
PENNSYLVANIA								
					(Sub)	(Non-Sub)		
Stafford Student Loan	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X	X	$1,076,000,000	399,000
Institutional Assistance Grants	$28,074,000			X		X	$28,200,000	32,725
Matching Funds	$3,938,700			X	X		$31,800,000	46,063
Work-Study Program	$2,198,300			X	X		$4,400,000	2,400
Health Education Assistance Loan	$0	Grad		X	X		$65,000,000	6,000
Higher Education Loan Plan (excluding Non-Sub & SLS)	$0	Und/Grad		X	X		$21,000,000	5,000
Loan Forgiveness Program	$600,000	Grad		X		X	$585,900	310
Science Teachers Education Program	$800,000	Grad		X		X	$550,000	1,200
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$376,500*	Und	X			X	$376,500	251
Urban/Rural Loan Forgiveness	$3,467,000	Grad		X		X	$3,400,000	1,700
PLUS/SLS	N/A	Und/Grad		X		X	$180,800,000	52,723
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$740,000*	Und	X			X	$745,285	157
Agriculture Loan Forgiveness	$724,000	Grad		X		X	$500,000	250
RHODE ISLAND								
Intern Program[1]	$10,000	Und/Grad		X		X	N/A	300
Consolidation Loan	$0	Und/Grad		X		X	$1,139,022	86
Stafford Loan Program	$0	Und/Grad		X	X		$50,492,586	17,978
PLUS/SLS	$0	Und/Grad		X		X	$10,907,312	3,455
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$90,083*	Und	X			X	$90,000	18
Best and Brightest Teacher Scholarship	$200,000	Und	X			X	$180,000	36
Community Service[2]		Und		X	X		$137,000	65
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$41,860*	Und/Grad	X			X	$41,860	13
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$38,350*	Und	X			X	$36,000	24
TENNESSEE								
Stafford Loan	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		N/A	N/A
PLUS	N/A	Und		X	X		N/A	N/A
Teacher Loan Scholarship Program	$330,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$300,000	225
SLS	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		N/A	N/A
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$293,328*	Und		X		X	$330,000	69
Disadvantaged Areas	$30,000	Und	X			X	$27,000	20
Minority Fellows	$285,000	Und		X		X	$285,000	57
Robert C. Byrd Scholarship	$171,000*	Und	X			X	$171,000	114

State/Program	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
TEXAS								
Hinson-Hazlewood Loan Program	Bond sale funds	Und/Grad		X	X		$87,900,000	23,700
College Work-Study	$2,000,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$2,800,000	4,357
Public Educational Grant (on campus)	$32,078,731	Und/Grad		X	X		$32,000,000	48,000
Good Neighbor Scholarship Program	$831,753	Und/Grad				X		
Baylor Medical Scholarship	$31,809,414	Grad		X		X	$31,800,000	N/A
Baylor Dental Scholarship	$13,407,596	Grad		X		X	$13,400,000	N/A
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship		Und/Grad	X			X	$1,000,000	318
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$649,500*	Und				X		
UTAH								
Career Teaching Scholarship	$674,000	Und/Grad	X			X	$674,000	360
SLS/PLUS	N/A	Und/Grad		X		X	$16,300,000	5,800
Stafford Student Loans	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		$111,400,000	38,000
VERMONT								
Honors Scholarship	$9,500	Und				X		
Student Employment Program	$125,000	Und		X	X		$250,000	200
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$30,475*	Und				X		
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$33,846*	Und			X			
VIRGINIA								
Work-Study Program	$1,800,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$1,795,000	1,400
WASHINGTON								
State Work-Study	$12,211,650	Und/Grad		X	X		$12,211,650	6,023
Health Professions Loan Repayment Program	$214,000			X		X	$214,000	5
WICHE	$207,150			X	X		$113,600	16
Future Teacher Conditional Scholarship	$279,155	Und/Grad	X			X	$279,155	93
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$292,697*	Und/Grad	X			X	$323,982	70
Paul Fowler Academic Excellence Scholarships	$30,570	Und	X			X	$30,570	15
Rural Physician, Pharmacist & Midwife Scholarship	$49,270		X			X	$36,000	9
Scholars Program	$885,827	Und	X			X	$885,827	355
Nurses Conditional Scholarship Program	$158,940	Und/Grad	X			X	$156,847	52
WEST VIRGINIA								
Institutional Undergraduate Tuition and Fee Waiver Program	$0	Und				X	$5,000,000	
Institutional Graduate and Professional Tuition and Fee Waiver Program	$0	Grad				X	$2,000,000	
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$119,947*	Und				X		24
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	$76,150*	Und				X		42
Underwood-Smith Teacher Scholarship	$812,565	Und/Grad				X		163
Medical Student Loan Program	$682,688	Grad		X		X	$775,490	155

State/Program	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
WISCONSIN								
Nursing Loan	$333,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$333,000	225
Minority Teacher Loan Program	$50,000	Und		X	X		$50,000	15
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$294,205*	Und		X		X	$294,205	70
PUERTO RICO								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	$211,825*	Und				X		
Tuition Remission	$3,000,000							

* Indicates that dollars are federal allocations to the states, not state appropriations.

[1] Program collects matching dollars from agencies of $45,000 to $55,000 per year, yielding between $200,000 and $400,000 in student earnings.

[2] Monies appropriated under the Scholarship and Grant Program are used in this program.

TABLE 7

STATE FUNDED STUDENT AID PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY
STATE AGENCIES OTHER THAN THE RESPONDING AGENCY

State/Program	Administering Agency	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
ALABAMA									
Medical Scholarships/Loans	Medical Scholarship Board	$677,000	Grad	X		X		$656,000	218
Dental Scholarships/Loans	Dental Scholarship Board	$176,000	Grad	X		X		$156,000	36
Optometry Scholarships/Loans	Optometry Scholarship Board	$149,000	Grad	X		X		$110,000	52
Alabama G.I.	Dept. of Veteran Affairs	$4,144,693	Und		X		X	$2,538,000	2,900
Vocational Rehabilitation	State Dept. of Education	$7,939,853	Und/Grad		X	X		$3,751,249	4,100
CALIFORNIA									
Educational Opportunity Program	California State University		Und		X	X		$14,013,880	17,800
Extended Opportunity Programs & Svcs.	California Community Colleges		Und		X	X		N/A	N/A
State University Grants	California State University		Und/Grad		X	X		$69,396,205	89,072
Board of Governors Grants	California Community Colleges		Und		X	X		N/A	N/A
Graduate Equity Fellowship Program	California State University		Grad		X	X		$824,952	635
COLORADO									
National Guard Tuition Assistance	Dept. of Military Affairs	$406,753	Und/Grad		X		X		N/A
CONNECTICUT									
Tuition Set Aside Program[1]	Each Public College Unit		Und/Grad		X	X		$15,100,000	21,000
DELAWARE									
Ivy Davis Scholarship	Foster Care Review Board	$0	Und/Grad	X		X		$15,000	7
GEORGIA									
Rural Doctor Program	State Medical Education Board	$728,000	Grad	X		X		$728,000	91
Regents Scholarship	Board of Regents	$184,000	Und/Grad	X		X		$191,250	306
Regents Opportunity Grant	Board of Regents	$553,000	Grad	X		X		$693,750	185
ILLINOIS									
MIA/POW Descendants Scholarships	Dept. of Veteran Affairs	$531,500							450
Nursing Education Scholarships	Dept. of Public Health	$250,000							75
Math/Science Scholarships	State Board of Education	$25,000							25
Teacher Shortage Area Scholarships	State Board of Education	$453,000							400
Women/Minority in Admin. Scholarships	State Board of Education	$276,000							375
Gifted Program Fellowships	State Board of Education	$50,000							25
Gifted Program Traineeships	State Board of Education	$35,000							30
Medical Scholarship Program	Board of Higher Education	$2,600,000							120
General Assembly Scholarships	State Board of Education	Tuition & Fee Waiver							8
Teacher of Secondary Science/Math	State Board of Education	$8,000							4

State/Program	Administering Agency	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
IOWA									
Student Aid Set Aside	State Board of Regents	$27,783,392							
Vocational Rehabilitation	Vocational Rehabilitation	$1,416,006			X	X		$1,416,006	4,200
Commission for the Blind	Commission for the Blind	$50,395			X		X	$50,395	134
KENTUCKY									
Vocational Rehabilitation	Work Force Cabinet	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		N/A	N/A
College Work-Study	Institutions	$2,171,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$2,171,000	N/A
Perkins Loans	Institutions	$102,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$102,000	N/A
SEOG	Institutions	$422,000	Und		X	X		$422,000	N/A
Statutory Programs	Institutions	$1,353,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$1,353,000	N/A
Commonwealth Scholars	Institutions	$1,551,000	Und	X			X	$1,551,000	N/A
Tuition Reciprocity	Institutions	$4,359,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$4,359,000	N/A
LOUISIANA									
Education Majors Scholarship	State Dept. of Education	$1,777,000	Und	X			X	$1,777,000	1,055
Alternative Post. Bacc. Scholarship	State Dept. of Education	$450,563	Grad	X			X	$450,563	350
MASSACHUSETTS									
Massachusetts Plan Program	Mass. Educ. Finance Authority	$5,000,000	Und		X		X	$45,000,000	4,500
MICHIGAN									
Tuition Incentive Program	Dept. of Social Services	$2,960,000	N/A		X	X		N/A	N/A
Education Trust Program	Treasury Dept.	N/A	N/A		X		X	N/A	N/A
MISSOURI									
Teacher Education Scholarship	Elementary/Secondary Education	$249,000	Und	X			X	$249,000	249
Robert Byrd Scholarship	Elementary/Secondary Education	$172,168*	Und	X			X	$196,500	131
NEW HAMPSHIRE									
Governor's Success Grant	Institutions	$347,000	Und		X	X		$347,000	
Nursing Leveraged Grant	Institutions	$40,000	Und			X			
NEW JERSEY									
Veterans Tuition Credit	Dept. of Military Affairs	$47,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$50,000	200
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Aid	Dept. of Military Affairs	$32,000	Und		X		X	$33,000	50
POW/MIA Program	Dept. of Military Affairs	$17,000	Und		X		X	$15,660	2
NEW MEXICO									
(need-based)	Public Institutions	$915,098	Und			X			
Three Percent Scholarships (non-need based)	Public Institutions	$2,058,971	Und				X	N/A	N/A
National Guard	New Mexico National Guard	N/A			X		X	N/A	N/A
Athletic Scholarships	Public Institutions	$1,977,600	Und				X	N/A	N/A
Competitive Scholarships	Public Institutions	$2,040,482	Und				X	N/A	N/A
NEW YORK									
College Work-Study Reimbursement[2]	State Education Dept.	$0	Und		X				
Native American Postsecondary Aid	State Education Dept.	$385,000	Und		X		X	$385,000	626
Transit Corps of Engineers Program	New York City Transit Auth.	$300,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$0	0

State/Program	Administering Agency	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
NORTH CAROLINA									
Community College Scholarships	Dept. of Community Colleges	$280,000	Und		X	X		$280,000	Unknown
Teaching Fellows	Public School Forum	$7,760,000	Und	X			X	$7,760,000	400
Prospective Teacher Scholarship/Loan	Dept. of Public Instruction	$2,413,820	Und		X		X	$2,413,820	Unknown
State Contractual Scholarship	UNC - Board of Governors	$10,783,420	Und		X	X		$10,783,420	Unknown
American Indian Scholarship	UNC - Board of Governors	$155,200	Und/Grad		X	X		$155,200	Unknown
Minority Presence Grants	UNC - Board of Governors	$1,500,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$1,140,000	Unknown
Tuition Remission	UNC Campuses	$13,506,435	Und/Grad		X	X		$13,506,435	Unknown
Appropriated Grants	UNC - Board of Governors	$8,086,214	Und		X	X		$8,086,214	Unknown
Veterans Scholarships	Dept. of Veterans Affairs	$3,213,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$3,213,000	Unknown
Vocational Rehabilitation	Dept. of Vocational Rehab.	$2,800,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$2,800,000	Unknown
Incentive Grants	UNC Campuses	$1,900,000	Und	X			X	$1,900,000	Unknown
OHIO									
Vocational Rehabilitation	Dept. of Vocational Rehab.	N/A	N/A	N/A		X		N/A	N/A
Nurse Education Assistance Program	Student Loan Commission	N/A	Und		X	X		N/A	N/A
Teacher Education Loan Forgiveness	Student Loan Commission	N/A	Und	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
National Guard Assistance Program	Ohio National Guard	N/A	Und	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
RHODE ISLAND									
Vocational Rehabilitation[3]					X	X		$337,325	278
SOUTH CAROLINA									
Teacher Loan Program	S.C. Student Loan Corp.	$4,800,000		X			X	$4,800,000	1,325
State Grant Program	Commission on Higher Education	$25,000		X			X	$24,750	33
Graduate Incentive Fellowship	Commission on Higher Education	$251,818		X		X		$285,000	38
Other Race Grant Program	Commission on Higher Education	$62,955		X		X		$100,000	100
SREB Contract Program (Veterinary and Optometry)	Commission on Higher Education	$684,800		X		X		$683,964	81
Contract with North Carolina School of Arts	Commission on Higher Education	$16,777		X			X	$16,770	13
Palmetto Fellows Scholarships	Commission on Higher Education	$370,000		X			X	$100,000	40
TENNESSEE									
Vocational Rehabilitation	Human Services							$9,881,308	7,891
TEXAS									
Resident Tuition Exemptions	Public Colleges	Tuition Remission	Und/Grad		X		X	$6,200,000	21,956
Non-Resident Tuition Waivers	Public Colleges	Tuition Remission	Und/Grad		X		X	$58,500,000	40,000
Line Item Scholarships	Institutions	$3,423,481	Und/Grad		X	X		$3,400,000	4,800

State/Program	Administering Agency	1992-93 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based Yes	Merit-Based No	Need-Based Yes	Need-Based No	Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
UTAH									
Tuition Waivers	USHE Institutions	$0	Und/Grad	X		X		$9,500,000	N/A
Educationally Disadvantaged	USHE Institutions	$1,221,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$696,000	2,300
Regional Dental Exchange Progra	Univeristy of Utah	$457,000	Grad	X			X	$337,500	30
SEOG	USHE Institutions	$488,600	Und		X	X		$3,033,200	5,300
CWS	USHE Institutions	$100,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$3,482,800	3,000
Perkins Loans	USHE Institutions	$204,500	Und/Grad		X	X		$9,124,300	6,000
WEST VIRGINIA									
State War Orphan Act	Dept. of Veteran Affairs	$2,000	Und/Grad		X		X	$1,800	4
Vocational Rehabilitation	Div. of Rehabilitation Svcs.	$280,000	Und/Grad		X	X		$1,300,000	1,200
Public Health Trust Scholarship	Attorney General	$33,837	Und/Grad		X	X		$3,750	5
Veterans Benefits	Adjutant General	$720,000	Und		X		X	$720,000	1,200
WISCONSIN									
Lawton Minority	University of Wisconsin	$1,875,600	Und		X	X		$1,875,600	1,250
Minority Tuition	University of Wisconsin	$132,000	Und		X	X		$132,000	90
Minority Teacher Loan Forgiveness	University of Wisconsin	$100,000	Und		X		X	$100,000	50

1• Indicates that dollars are federal allocations to the states, not state appropriations.

[1] No appropriation by state. Public colleges must set aside an amount equal to 15% of the previous year's tuition revenues for financial aid to needy students.

[2] Reimbursement to schools for their share of funds expended in participation in federal work study program.

[3] Vocational Rehabilitation uses part of its total appropriation to supplement students' tuition, fees, room and board, etc. They have no separate appropriation for "student aid." Approximately $337,325 will be used for student aid.

TABLE 8

STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM ACTIVITIES BY STATES

State	1991-92 SSIG Used	Estimated 1992-93 SSIG Amount	1992-93 Need-Based Award Dollars Only	SSIG As a Percent of 1992-93 Need-Based Award Dollars
ALABAMA	$ 982,808	$ 1,070,861	$ 2,312,927	46.3%
ALASKA	104,923	114,323	469,500	24.3
ARIZONA	1,080,891	1,220,795	2,441,600	50.0
ARKANSAS	401,696	455,330	6,319,000	7.2
CALIFORNIA	9,485,225	11,057,000	153,645,000	7.2
COLORADO	982,730	982,730	15,824,071	6.2
CONNECTICUT	863,000	973,201	20,805,000	4.7
DELAWARE	176,214	192,002	1,329,850	14.4
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	481,100	524,112	1,068,748	49.0
FLORIDA	2,068,222	2,252,418	29,638,187	7.6
GEORGIA	1,102,560	1,249,772	4,951,152	25.2
HAWAII	240,157	295,718	724,436	40.8
IDAHO	220,302	241,003	747,003	32.3
ILLINOIS	3,430,700	4,200,000	203,531,800	2.1
INDIANA	1,400,000	1,438,994	55,813,526	2.6
IOWA	544,182	619,021	34,067,175	1.8
KANSAS	731,901	797,474	6,893,493	11.6
KENTUCKY	806,685	878,958	20,520,000	4.3
LOUISIANA	940,431	1,024,687	5,125,574	20.0
MAINE	236,739	257,948	5,200,000	5.0
MARYLAND	1,204,441	1,312,615	21,102,050	6.2
MASSACHUSETTS	0	2,314,006	45,989,006	5.0
MICHIGAN	2,731,516	2,974,000	78,688,283	3.8
MINNESOTA	1,200,000	1,400,000	83,170,000	1.7
MISSISSIPPI	498,437	609,168	1,244,496	48.9
MISSOURI	1,303,415	1,422,034	11,097,034	12.8
MONTANA	182,076	198,408	418,408	47.4
NEBRASKA	473,556	515,983	2,612,337	19.8
NEVADA	179,444	196,292	400,957	49.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	230,243	250,872	1,252,872	20.0
NEW JERSEY	1,665,000	1,887,000	120,321,690	1.6
NEW MEXICO	322,300	365,300	8,890,400	4.1
NEW YORK	5,585,785	6,083,249	564,769,000	1.1
NORTH CAROLINA	1,348,269	1,562,909	4,323,900	36.1
NORTH DAKOTA	176,942	192,795	2,161,747	8.9
OHIO	2,517,210	2,853,266	66,000,266	4.3
OKLAHOMA	889,431	969,118	14,921,548	6.5
OREGON	815,536	924,425	12,605,823	7.3
PENNSYLVANIA	2,904,203	3,162,849	173,214,326	1.8
RHODE ISLAND	348,574	379,736	9,586,147	4.0
SOUTH CAROLINA	711,956	778,556	17,104,799	4.6
SOUTH DAKOTA	180,228	204,292	586,992	34.8
TENNESSEE	1,069,482	1,165,096	13,722,596	8.5
TEXAS	3,611,028	3,604,723	30,288,815	11.9
UTAH	475,526	534,700	1,114,700	48.0
VERMONT	165,887	180,750	11,270,974	1.6
VIRGINIA	1,406,736	1,406,736	6,654,473	21.1
WASHINGTON	1,329,619	1,306,142	23,570,237	5.5
WEST VIRGINIA	479,706	522,685	5,817,685	8.9
WISCONSIN	1,324,093	1,500,884	44,224,584	3.4
WYOMING	106,492	112,500	225,000	50.0
PUERTO RICO	590,463	643,365	22,432,122	2.9
Grand Totals	$62,308,060	$71,380,801	$1,971,261,309	3.6%

Note: SSIG allocations received by American Samoa, Guam, Trust Territory, and Virgin Islands not reported as they did not respond to the survey.

TABLE 9

SELECTED PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS, 1992-93

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
ALABAMA				
Student Assistance Program	1975	$2,500	I	N
Alabama Student Grant Program	1978	$1,200		N
National Guard Education Assistance Program	1984	$1,000		N
Chiropractic Scholarships	1985	$10,000	I	N
Emergency Secondary Education Scholarship Program	1984	$3,996		Y
Police Officer's and Firefighter's Survivor's Education Assistance Program	1987	$3,000		N
ALASKA				
Student Incentive Grant	1978	$1,500	UM	N
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)	1955	$22,800		N
WAMI Medical Exchange Program	1971	$37,262		N
ARIZONA				
Incentive Grant Program	1977	$2,500	I	N
ARKANSAS				
Student Assistance Grant	1975	$624	CM	N
MIA/KIA Dependents Scholarship	1973	$5,000		N
Law Enforcement Officers' Depend. Schlrshp.	1973	$4,000		N
Governor's Scholars Program	1984	$2,000		Y
Academic Challenge Scholarship	1991	$1,000	O	Y
CALIFORNIA				
Cal Grant A	1956	$4,452	CM	Y
Cal Grant B	1969	$5,648	CM	Y
Cal Grant C	1973	$2,450	CM	Y
Law Enforcement Personnel	1970	$1,500	C	N
Graduate Fellowship	1966	$5,504	CM	Y

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
COLORADO				
Student Incentive Grants	1977	$2,500	CM	N
Student Grants	1971	$2,000	CM	N
Graduate Grants	1971	$4,000	CM	N
Part-Time Student Grant	1991	$2,500	CM	N
Undergraduate Merit Awards	1971	Tuition & Fees		Y
Extended Studies Grant	1982	Tuition	CM	N
Graduate Fellowship	1971	$4,000		Y
CONNECTICUT				
Aid for Public College Students Grant Program	1987	$8,000	CM	N
Independent College Student Grant Program	1976	$6,700	CM	N
Scholastic Achievement Grants	1981	$2,000	C	Y
High Technology Graduate Scholarship	1984	$10,000		Y
DELAWARE				
Diamond State Scholars	1984	$1,000		Y
Postsecondary Scholarship Fund	1978	$1,000	CM	N
Educational Benefits for Children of Deceased Military and Police	1974	Full Tuition		N
Bradford Barnes Scholarship	1988	$7,478		Y
Governor's Workforce Development Grant	1992	$1,000	S	N
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
Incentive Grants	1976	$1,500	CM,P,G	N
FLORIDA				
Student Assistance Grants	1972	$978	CM	N
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarship	1982	Recommended by Tribe on Individual Basis	CM,O	N
Tuition Voucher Fund	1979	$924		N
Undergraduate Scholars' Fund	1981	$2,225		Y
Graduate Scholars' Fund	1986	$10,000		Y
Scholarships for Children of Deceased/Disabled Veterans/POW/MIA	1941	Tuition & Fees		N
M. M. Bethune Scholarship Challenge Grant	1990	$3,000	CM	Y
Vocational Gold Seal Endorsement Scholarship	1991	$1,800		Y

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
FLORIDA (cont.)				
Jose Marti Scholarship Challenge Grant	1986	$2,000	CM	Y
Confederate Memorial Scholarships	1921	$150		N
Exceptional Student Education State Training Grant	1963	$1,800		Y
Regent Scholarship	1983	$4,589		N
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	1984	$4,588		N
Critical Teacher Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program	1983	$702		Y
Challenger Astronauts Memorial Scholarships	1987	$4,000		Y
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Student Member Scholarship	1990	$4,589		N
State Board of Community Colleges Student Member Scholarship	1990	$4,589		N
GEORGIA				
Student Incentive Grants	1974	$2,500	CM	N
Tuition Equalization Grants	1972	$1,000		N
Law Enforcement Personnel Dependents Grants	1972	$2,000		N
Governor's Scholarship Program	1985	$1,540		N
North Georgia College/ROTC Grants	1977	$300		N
HAWAII				
Student Incentive Grants	1980	$2,500	UM	N
IDAHO				
Student Incentive Grants	1975	$2,500	C	N
State of Idaho Scholarship	1974	$2,650		Y
ILLINOIS				
Monetary Award Program	1958	$3,500	C	N
Student-to-Student Matching Grants	1973	$1,000	I	N
National Guard Scholarships	1977	Tuition & Fees		N
Descendants Grants	1973	Tuition & Fees or $3,500		N
Merit Recognition Scholarships	1986	$1,000		Y
Veteran Grants	1987	Tuition & Fees		N
College Bond Incentive Grant	1991	$60		N

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
INDIANA				
Hoosier Scholarships	1981	$500		Y
Higher Education/Freedom of Choice Grants	1966		CM	N
IOWA				
Scholarship Program	1965	$400	CM,O	Y
Tuition Grant Program	1969	$2,650	C	N
Vo-Tech Tuition Grants	1973	$600	C	N
Iowa Grant	1990	$1,000	CM	N
Osteopathic Grant	1989	$3,000		N
KANSAS				
State Scholarships	1963	$1,000	CM	Y
Tuition Grants	1972	$1,700	CM	N
Vocational Scholarship Program	1987	$500		Y
Minority Scholarships	1989	$1,500	CM	Y
KENTUCKY				
Tuition Grant Program	1975	$1,200	S,O	N
College Access Grant Program	1990	$700	CM	N
LOUISIANA				
Incentive Grants	1972	$2,000	I	Y
T. H. Harris Scholarships	1940	$400		Y
Honors Scholarship	1992	$1,800		Y
Tuition Assistance Plan	1989	$1,800	S	Y
MAINE				
Incentive Grant	1978	$1,000	C	N
MARYLAND				
General State Scholarships	1961	$2,500	C	Y
Senatorial Scholarships	Prior to 1970	$2,000	CM	Y
Jack T. Tolbert Grants	1979	$1,500	S	N
Delegate Scholarships	Prior to 1970	$5,000		N
Edward T. Conroy Memorial Program	Prior to 1970	$2,674		N
Professional Scholarships	Prior to 1970	$1,000	CM	N
Distinguished Scholar	1979	$3,000		Y

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
MASSACHUSETTS				
General Scholarships	1957	$2,500	C	N
Christian Herter Scholarship		1/2 Cost of Student Expense Budget	I	N
Cash Grant	1992	Tuition	I	N
MICHIGAN				
Educational Opportunity Grants	1986	$1,000	CM	N
Adult Part-Time Grants	1986	$600	C	N
Competitive Scholarships	1964	$1,200	C	Y
Tuition Grants	1966	$2,025	C	N
MINNESOTA				
State Grant Program	1968	$5,848	CM	N
Part-Time Grant		$972	C	N
Rural Nursing Grant	1990	$1,169	CM,P	N
Dislocated Rural Workers Program	1990	N/A	I	N
Non-AFDC Child Care Grant	1990	N/A	CM	
Safety Officers Survivor Grant	1990	$3,341		N
MISSISSIPPI				
Student Incentive Grants	1975	$1,500	UM,CM,I,P,G	N
POW/MIA/Law/Firemen Scholarship	1942	Based on Institution's Tuition & Room Charges		N
Public Management Graduate Intern Program	1980	$5,000		Y
MISSOURI				
Student Grants	1972	$1,500	CM	N
Higher Education Academic Scholarships	1987	$2,000		Y
Public Service Officer or Employee's Child Survivor Grant Program	1988	$2,300		N
MONTANA				
Student Incentive Grants	1976	$900	CM	N

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis (UM=Uniform Methodology, U=Modified UM, CM=Congressional Methodology, C=Modified CM, I=Institutions Choose, S=State System, P=Pell System, G=GAPSFAS, O=Other)	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award (Y=Yes, N=No)
NEBRASKA				
State Scholarship Award Program	1989	$2,500	P	N
Scholarship Assistance Program	1989	Determined by Institution	P	N
Postsecondary Education Award Program	1991	Determined by Institution	P	N
NEVADA				
Student Incentive Grants	1977	$2,500	I	N
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
Incentive Program	1976	$1,000	P	Y
Nursing Education Grants	1959		P	N
War Orphans Scholarships	1943	$1,000		N
NEW JERSEY				
Tuition Aid Grants	1977	$4,500	C	N
Garden State Scholarships	1977	$500		Y
Educational Opportunity Fund - Undergraduates	1968	$1,950	C	N
Educational Opportunity Fund - Graduates	1968	$4,000	G	N
Public Tuition Benefits	1979	$3,510		N
Part-Time Tuition Aid Grants	1988	$3,265	C	N
Garden State Urban Scholars Program	1988	$1,000		Y
Edward J. Bloustein Distinguished Scholars Program	1984	$1,000		Y
Garden State Graduate Fellowship	1977	$7,500		Y
Martin Luther King Physician-Dentist Scholarships	1989	$11,053	G	N
C. Clyde Ferguson Law Scholarship	1990	$6,667	G	N
NEW MEXICO				
Student Incentive Grant	1980	$2,500	CM	N
Student Choice	1984	$2,273	UM	N
Scholars Program	1989	$2,490	CM	Y

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
NEW MEXICO (cont.)				
Vietnam Veterans Scholarships	1985	$2,000		N
Graduate Fellowships	1988	$7,200	I	N
NEW YORK				
Tuition Assistance Program	1974	$4,050	S	N
Aid for Part-Time Study	1984	$2,000	O	N
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Assistance	1984	$1,000 - Full-Time $500 - Part-Time		N
Empire State Scholarships of Excellence	1986	$2,000		Y
Health Services Corps	1985	$15,000		Y
Regents Professional Opportunity Schlrshps	1985	$5,000		N
Regents Health Care Opportunity Schlrshps	1985	$10,000		N
Lehman Fellowships	1971	$5,000		Y
Police Officers/Firefighters/ Corrections Officer Awards	Police - 1982 Firefighters - 1983 Corrections - 1987	$450		N
Children of Veterans Awards	1936	$450		N
Memorial Scholarship for Children of Deceased Police Officers & Firefighters	1991	State University Tuition & Non-Tuition Costs		N
NORTH CAROLINA				
Student Incentive Grant	1975	$1,500	CM	N
Board of Governors Medical Scholarships	1974	$26,000	CM	Y
Legislative Tuition Grants	1975	$1,092		N
Board of Governors Dental Scholarships	1978	Tuition & Registration Fee $12,500	CM	Y
NORTH DAKOTA				
Student Financial Assistance Program	1973	$600	CM	N
OHIO				
Instructional Grants	1970	$3,468	O	N
Academic Scholarship	1978	$1,000		Y

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
OHIO (cont.)				
War Orphans Scholarship	1954	Private - $2,095 Public - Full Instr. & General Fees		N
Student Choice Grants	1984	$565		N
Regents Graduate/Professional Fellowship	1986	$3,500		Y
Scholarships for Children of Deceased Police Officers and Firefighters	1980	Public - Full Instr. & General Fees Private - Comparable Amt.		N
OKLAHOMA				
Tuition Aid Grants	1974	$1,000	S	N
Future Teachers Scholarship Program	1984	$1,500		N
William P. Willis Scholarship Program	1986	$3,050	S	N
Chiropractic Education Assistance Program	1972	$3,000		Y
Minority Doctoral Study Grants	1975	$4,000		N
Minority Professional Study Grants	1977	$6,000		N
Academic Scholars Program	1988	$4,500		Y
OREGON				
Need Grant	1971	$1,920	CM(dependent applicants),O	N
Cash Award	1961	$864	U(dependent applicants),O	Y
PENNSYLVANIA				
State Grant Program	1966	$2,400	S	N
POW/MIA Program	1972	$1,200	S	N
RHODE ISLAND				
Scholarship and Grant Program	1978	$800	CM	N
SOUTH CAROLINA				
Tuition Grant Program	1970	$3,990	S	Y
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Student Incentive Grants	1974	$600	I	N
Tuition Equalization Grants	1978	$250	I	N
Superior Scholar Scholarship	1984	$1,500		Y

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
TENNESSEE				
Student Assistance Awards	1976	$1,482	P	N
Academic Scholars Program	1986	$5,000		Y
Community Colleges Program	1990	$2,000		Y
Dependent Children Scholarship	1981	$5,600		N
TEXAS				
Tuition Equalization Grants	1971	$3,684	CM,P,G	N
Public Educational SSIG Program	1975	$2,500	CM,P,G	N
State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment	1981	$1,000	CM,P,G	N
Tax Reimbursement Grants	1985	$2,500	CM,P,G	N
Nursing Scholarships	1990	$3,000	CM,P,G	N
UTAH				
Incentive Grants	1974	$2,500	CM	N
WICHE	1953	$18,400		Y
VERMONT				
Incentive Grants	1965	$4,950	C	N
Part-Time Student Grant	1981	$3,710	C	N
Non-Degree Student Grant Program	1985	$325	S	N
VIRGINIA				
College Scholarship Assistance Program	1973	$2,000	CM	N
Tuition Assistance Grant Program	1973	$1,440		N
Virginia Scholars Program	1984	$3,000		Y
Virginia Transfer Grant	1983	Depends on Tuition & Fees		N
Undergraduate Student Financial Assistance Program	1988	Depends on Tuition & Fees	CM	N
Eastern Shore Tuition Assistance Program	1973	$1,500		N
WASHINGTON				
Need Grant Program	1970	$2,067	C	N
Assistance to Blind Students	1974	$300 per semester	CM	N
Educational Opportunity Grant	1990	$2,500	CM	N

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1992-93	Need Analysis UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS O=Other	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
WEST VIRGINIA				
		$1,964 - In-State Private $1,368 - In-State Public		
Higher Education Grant Program	1968	$600 - Out-of-State	CM	Y
WISCONSIN				
Tuition Grant Program	1965	$2,172	CM	N
Independent Student Grants	1990	$6,000	CM	N
Higher Education Grant Program	1976	$1,800	CM	N
Indian Student Grant	1971	$2,200	CM	N
Vo-Tech Student Minority Grant	1987	$2,500	CM	N
Talent Incentive Grant Program	1972	$1,800	CM	N
Private School Student Minority Grant	1986	$2,500	CM	N
Handicapped Student Grants	1976	$1,800	CM	N
Academic Excellence Scholarships	1990	$2,300		Y
WYOMING				
Incentive Grants	1977		I	N
PUERTO RICO				
Supplementary Assistance Program	1982		P	N
Educational Fund	1969		P	N
Legislative Awards	1955		P	N
Student Incentive Grant	1974	$1,000	P	Y

FOOTNOTES FOR TABLE 9

NEED ANALYSIS - OTHER CRITERIA

ARKANSAS	
Academic Challenge Scholarship	Average AGI for two previous years must meet legislative guidelines.
FLORIDA	
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarship	Determined by tribe.
IOWA	
Scholarship Program	Look up chart with income only.
KENTUCKY	
Tuition Grant Program	KTG award to a maximum of $1,200 = total cost of education (tuition and fees plus low room rate plus high board rate) less sum of Pell Grant, College Access Program Grant and CMFC.
NEW YORK	
Aid for Part-Time Study	Tuition minus other grant aid. Schools select recipients.
OHIO	
Instructional Grants	An income-based tables-of-grants.
OREGON	
Need Grant Cash Award	Total income and household size - independent applicant.

TABLE 10

ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS

I = In-State Only
O = Out-of-State Only
B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
ALABAMA									
Chiropractic Scholarships									O*
Student Assistance Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
Student Grant Program		I		I					
National Guard Education Assistance Program	I	I	I	I	I	I			
Emergency Secondary Ed. Scholarship Program	I	I							
Police Officers' and Firefighters' Survivors' Education Assistance Program	I		I		I				
ALASKA									
Incentive Grant Program	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B*
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)	B	B							
WAMI Medical Exchange Program	O								
ARIZONA									
Incentive Grant Program	I	I	I	I		I			
ARKANSAS									
Student Assistance Grant	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Governor's Scholars Program	I	I	I	I					
MIA/KIA Dependents Scholarship	I		I		I				
Law Enforcement Officers' Dep. Scholarship	I		I						
Academic Challenge Scholarship	I	I	I	I					
CALIFORNIA									
Cal Grant A	I	I	I	I*	I*	I*	I*	I*	
Cal Grant B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Cal Grant C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Law Enforcement Personnel	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Graduate Fellowship	I	I					I	I	I*
COLORADO									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I		I	I	I		
Student Grants	I	I	I		I	I	I		
Graduate Grants	I	I					I		
Undergraduate Merit Awards	I	I	I		I	I	I		
Part-Time Student Grant	I	I	I		I	I	I		

I = In-State Only
O = Out-of-State Only
B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
COLORADO (cont.)									
Extended Studies Grant	I								
Graduate Fellowship	I	I							
CONNECTICUT									
Scholastic Achievement Grants	B	B	B	B		B	B	B	
Independent College Student Grant Program		I		I					
Aid for Public College Students Grant Program	I		I						
High Technology Graduate Scholarship Program	I	I							
DELAWARE									
Postsecondary Scholarship Fund	B	B	B	B					
Educational Benefits for Children of Deceased Military and Police	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
Diamond State Scholars	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
Bradford Barnes Scholarship	I								
Governor's Workforce Development Grant	I	I	I	I					
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA									
Incentive Grants	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
FLORIDA									
Student Assistance Grants	I	I	I	I		I		I	
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Tuition Voucher Fund		I							
Undergraduate Scholars' Fund	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Graduate Scholars' Fund									I*
Scholarships for Children of Deceased/Disabled Veterans/POW/MIA	I		I		I				
Confederate Memorial Scholarships	I		I						
Exceptional Student Education State Training Grants	I	I	I	I					
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	I*								
Critical Teacher Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program	B	B	B	B					
Challenger Astronauts Memorial Scholarships	I	I	I						
Jose Marti Scholarship Challenge Grant	I	I	I	I			I	I	
M. M. Bethune Scholarship Challenge Grant									I*
Vocational Gold Seal Endorsement Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Regent Scholarship									B*
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Student Member Scholarship									B*

I = In-State Only
O = Out-of-State Only
B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
FLORIDA (cont.)									
State Board of Community Colleges Student Member Scholarship									B*
GEORGIA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	I*
Tuition Equalization Grants	O*	I		I					
Law Enforcement Personnel Dependents Grants	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	I*
Governors' Scholarship Program	I	I	I	I					
North Georgia College/ROTC Grants	I*								
HAWAII									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
IDAHO									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I			
State of Idaho Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I				
ILLINOIS									
Monetary Award Program	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Student-to-Student Matching Grants	I		I						
National Guard Scholarships	I		I						
Descendants Grants	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Merit Recognition Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Veteran Grants	I		I						
College Bond Incentive Grant	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
INDIANA									
Hoosier Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Higher Education/Freedom of Choice Grants	I	I	I	I	I			I	
IOWA									
Scholarship Program	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	I*
Tuition Grants		I		I				I	I*
Vo-Tech Tuition Grants			I		I				
Iowa Grant	I	I	I	I	I				
Osteopathic Grant									I*
KANSAS									
State Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
Tuition Grants		I		I		I			
Vocational Scholarship Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Minority Scholarships	I	I	I	I					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I = In-State Only
O = Out-of-State Only
B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
KENTUCKY									
Tuition Grant Program		I		I					
College Access Grant Program	I	I	I	I		I			
LOUISIANA									
Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
T. H. Harris Scholarships	I		I				I		
Honors Scholarship	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Tuition Assistance Plan	I		I				I		
MAINE									
Incentive Grants	B	B	B	B	B	B	I	I	
MARYLAND									
General State Scholarship	B	B	B	B			B	B	
Senatorial Scholarships	B*	B*	B*	B*		B*	B*	B*	
Jack T. Tolbert Grants						I			
Delegate Scholarships	B*	B*	B*	B*		B*	B*	B*	
Edward T. Conroy Memorial Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Professional Scholarships	I	I	I	I					
Distinguished Scholar	I	I	I	I		I			
MASSACHUSETTS									
General Scholarships	B*	B*	B*	B*	I	I	I	I	
Christian Herter Scholarship	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
Cash Grant	I		I						
MICHIGAN									
Educational Opportunity Grants	I		I						
Adult Part-Time Grants	I	I	I	I					
Competitive Scholarships	I	I	I	I					
Tuition Grants		I		I					
MINNESOTA									
State Grant Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Part-Time Grant	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Rural Nursing Grant	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Dislocated Rural Workers Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Safety Officers Survivor Grant	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
MISSISSIPPI									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I					
POW/MIA/Law/Firemen Scholarship	I		I						
Public Management Graduate Intern Program	O								

I = In-State Only
O = Out-of-State Only
B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
MISSOURI									
Student Grant Program	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Higher Education Academic Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Public Service Officer or Employee's Child Survivor Grant Program	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
MONTANA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I		I				I*
NEBRASKA									
Scholarship Assistance Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
State Scholarship Award Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Postsecondary Education Award Program		I		I					
NEVADA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I		I			
NEW HAMPSHIRE									
Incentive Program	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	I	B*	B*	
Nursing Education Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	O*
War Orphans Scholarships	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
NEW JERSEY									
Tuition Aid Grants	I	I	I	I		I*			
Garden State Scholarships	I	I	I	I		I*			
Educational Opportunity Fund - Undergrad	I	I	I						
Educational Opportunity Fund - Graduate	I	I							
Public Tuition Benefits	I	I	I	I					
Edward J. Bloustein Distinguished Scholars Program	I	I	I	I		I*			
Garden State Graduate Fellowship	I	I							
Part-Time Tuition Aid Grants	I	I	I	I					
Garden State Urban Scholars Program	I	I	I	I		I*			
Martin Luther King Physician-Dentist Scholarship	I								
C. Clyde Ferguson Law Scholarship	I	I							
NEW MEXICO									
Student Incentive Grant	I	I	I	I	I				
Student Choice		I							
Scholars Program	I	I	I	I	I				
Graduate Fellowships	I								
Vietnam Veterans Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I				

I = In-State Only
O = Out-of-State Only
B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
NEW YORK									
Tuition Assistance Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I*,O*
Aid for Part-Time Study	I	I	I	I		I*			
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Assistance	I	I	I	I	I	I*			
Empire State Scholarships of Excellence	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Police Officers/Firefighters/ Correction Officers Awards	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I*
Health Services Corps	B	B	B	B		B*	B	B	
Regents Professional Opportunity Schlrshps	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Regents Health Care Opportunity Schlrshps	I*	I*							
Lehman Fellowships	I	I							
Children of Veterans Awards	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I*
Memorial Scholarship for Children of Deceased Police Officers & Firefighters	I	I	I	I					
NORTH CAROLINA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I*			
Board of Governors Medical Scholarships	I*	I*							
Board of Governors Dental Scholarships	I*								
Legislative Tuition Grants		I		I					
NORTH DAKOTA									
Student Financial Assistance Program	I	I	I		I		I		
OHIO									
Instructional Grants	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	
Academic Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
War Orphans Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Student Choice Grants		I							
Regents Graduate/Professional Fellowships	I	I							
Scholarships for Children of Deceased Police Officers and Firefighters	I	I							
OKLAHOMA									
Tuition Aid Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Future Teachers Scholarship Program	I	I	I	I					
William P. Willis Scholarship Program	I		I						
Chiropractic Education Assistance Program									O*
Minority Doctoral Study Grants									I*
Minority Professional Study Grants									I*
Academic Scholars Program	I	I	I	I					I*

I = In-State Only
O = Out-of-State Only
B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
OREGON									
Need Grants	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Cash Awards	I	I	I	I			I	I	
PENNSYLVANIA									
State Grant Program	B	B	I	B		I	B	B	O*
POW/MIA Program	B	B	I	B		I	B	B	O*
RHODE ISLAND									
Scholarship and Grant Program	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
SOUTH CAROLINA									
Tuition Grant Program		I		I					
SOUTH DAKOTA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Tuition Equalization Grants		I		I					
Superior Scholar Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
TENNESSEE									
Student Assistance Awards	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Academic Scholars Program	I	I	I	I					
Community Colleges Program			I						
Dependent Children Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
TEXAS									
Tuition Equalization Grants		I		I					
Public Educational SSIG Grants	I		I		I				
State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment	I								
Tax Reimbursement Grants	I		I		I				
Nursing Scholarships						I	I		
UTAH									
Incentive Grants	I	I*	I		I				
WICHE	O	O							
VERMONT									
Incentive Grant	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
Non-Degree Student Grant Program	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
Part-Time Student Grant	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
VIRGINIA									
College Scholarship Assistance	I	I	I	I					
Tuition Assistance Grant Program		I		I				I	
Virginia Scholars Program	I	I							
Virginia Transfer Grant	I								

I = In-State Only
O = Out-of-State Only
B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
VIRGINIA (cont.)									
Undergrad Student Financial Assistance Pgm	I		I						
Eastern Shore Tuition Assistance Program	O*								
WASHINGTON									
Need Grant Program	I	I	I		I	I			
Assistance to Blind Students	I	I	I	I	I				
Educational Opportunity Grant	I	I							
WEST VIRGINIA									
Higher Education Grant Program	B*	B*	B*	B*				B*	
WISCONSIN									
Tuition Grant Program		I		I				I	
Higher Education Grant Program	I		I		I				
Indian Student Grant	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Talent Incentive Grant Program	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Handicapped Student Grants	B	B	B	B	B				
Private School Student Minority Grant		I		I					
Vo-Tech Student Minority Grants					I				
Independent Student Grants	I	I			I				
Academic Excellence Scholarship	I	I			I				
WYOMING									
Incentive Grants	I		I						
PUERTO RICO									
Legislative Awards	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Educational Fund	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Student Incentive Grant	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Supplementary Assistance Program	I		I				I		I*

FOOTNOTES FOR TABLE 10

ALABAMA	
Chiropractic Scholarships	O* - Chiropractic colleges.
ALASKA	
Incentive Grant	B* - Any nationally or regionally accredited institution.
CALIFORNIA	
Cal Grant A	I* - Programs must be at least two years in length or minimum of 1,800 clock hours.
Graduate Fellowship	I* - Accredited graduate and/or professional institutions.
FLORIDA	
Graduate Scholars' Fund	I* - Public and private institutions with high technology graduate programs.
M. M. Bethune Scholarship Challenge Grant	I* - Four predominantly black colleges in Florida.
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	I* - Only at University of Florida College of Law or Florida State University.
Regent Scholarship Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Student Member Scholarship	B* - The statute is silent on where the student must attend; however, the recipient is usually a graduate student attending a university.
State Board of Community Colleges Student Member Scholarship	B* - The statute is silent on where the student must attend; however, the recipient is usually an upper-level undergraduate student.
GEORGIA	
Student Incentive Grants Law Enforcement Personnel Dependents Grants	I* - Other hospital programs of study.
Tuition Equalization Grants	O* - Within 50 miles of Georgia.
North Georgia College/ROTC Grants	I* - Only at North Georgia College.
IOWA	
Scholarship Program Tuition Grants	I* - Proprietary, business, and Bible colleges.
Osteopathic Grants	I* - Private osteopathic medical school -- graduate students.
MARYLAND	
Delegate Scholarships Senatorial Scholarships	B* - Out-of-State -- Only if major is not offered in state.
MASSACHUSETTS	
General Scholarship	B* - Out-of-State -- Only in states where there is a reciprocity agreement.
MONTANA	
Student Incentive Grants	I* - Tribal community colleges.
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Incentive Program	B* - Any eligible out-of-state institution must be regionally accredited.
Nursing Education Grants	O* - For graduate level study only.
NEW JERSEY	
Tuition Aid Grants Garden State Scholarships Edward J. Bloustein Distinguished Scholars Program Garden State Urban Scholars Program	I* - Proprietary institutions with degree programs approved by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education.

NEW YORK	
Aid for Part-Time Study	I* - Degree-granting institutions only.
Tuition Assistance Program	I* - Registered business schools. O* - Out-of-state medical programs.
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Assistance	I* - Specifically approved vocational training programs of at least 320 clock hours.
Children of Veterans Awards Police Officers/Firefighters/ Correction Officers Awards	I* - Registered business schools.
Health Services Corps	B* - Degree-granting institutions only.
Regents Health Care Opportunity Scholarships	I* - Medical and dental schools.
NORTH CAROLINA	
Board of Governors Medical Scholarships	I* - Medical schools only.
Board of Governors Dental Scholarships	I* - Dental schools only.
Student Incentive Grants	I* - Only those licensed by the Board of Governors.
OHIO	
Instructional Grants	B* - Out-of-State -- Pennsylvania only.
OKLAHOMA	
Chiropractic Education Assistance Program	O* - Accredited chiropractic colleges that are recognized by the Oklahoma State Board of Chiropractic Examiners.
Minority Doctoral Study Grants Minority Professional Study Grants Academic Scholars Program	I* - Graduate and professional institutions.
PENNSYLVANIA	
State Grant Program POW/MIA Program	O* - Contiguous states must have a reciprocity agreement with Pennsylvania.
UTAH	
Incentive Grants	I* - Church-owned institutions do not participate.
VIRGINIA	
Eastern Shore Tuition Assistance Program	O* - Salisbury State University or the University of Maryland.
WEST VIRGINIA	
Higher Education Grant Program	B* - Limited to educational institutions in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania resulting from a reciprocal agreement.
PUERTO RICO	
Supplementary Assistance Program	I* - Graduate students at the University of Puerto Rico.

TABLE 11

COMMENTS TO AID SURVEY READERS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND AGENCY POSITIONS

ALABAMA	The two new programs--the Appalachian Youth Scholarship Program (AYSP) and the Paul Douglas Teachers Scholarship Program (PDTSP)--receive no state funding. All state-funded programs were essentially level-funded, except the Alabama Student Grant Program, which is a tuition differential grant program for students at certain private, non-profit Alabama colleges. This program received an 11.8 percent increase.
ALASKA	As in 1991-92, the long-term revenue forecasts have led to reductions in state funding of student aid programs.
CALIFORNIA	California's 1992-93 budget includes the most severe reductions in funding for higher education in the state's history. Student fees were increased by 24 to 40 percent, while funding for colleges and financial aid was cut by $500 million. Funding for state grants fell by $44 million, and all grants to students were reduced by 15 percent.
CONNECTICUT	Connecticut continues to distribute state financial aid in the following manner: 60 percent to Connecticut independent colleges; 30 percent to Connecticut public colleges; and 10 percent distributed through a centrally-administered need-based program that uses academic criteria.
FLORIDA	The economic recession forced us to reduce the amount of awards in all state-financed student aid programs.
GEORGIA	To make up for reductions in prior years, we increased the award amount from the Tuition Equalization Grant from $794 in 1991-92 to $1,000 for 1992-93.
ILLINOIS	A reduction in state revenues led to a 3 percent recision in 1991-92. Funding for 1992-93 for many state agencies was reduced even further. In FY 1993, the MAP Program received some additional funding to cover tuition increases at public universities and community colleges. Higher education institutions received level General Revenue funding, minus funds necessary to cover tuition increases in the MAP Program.
IOWA	Increased enrollment in our two-year public colleges is causing an increase in demand for grant awards. State funding has not kept pace with this rising demand.
KENTUCKY	We have merged the SSIG Program with the CAP Program. We plan to use federal SSIG allocations to match CAP Grants.

LOUISIANA	For 1992-93, Louisiana has implemented the Louisiana Honors Scholarship, a tuition waiver granted to the top 5 percent of Louisiana's high school graduates who attend a public or private college or university. The State Legislature also made changes to the Louisiana Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) method of determining financial need.
MAINE	A small portion of the state funding for MSISP awards was set aside for undergraduate part-time students. The award for eligible students is equal to one-half the amount of a full-time award at public or private institutions. We expect the majority of recipients will be non-traditional students.
MARYLAND	The program funding levels reported for the Senatorial and Delegate programs include FY 1992 levels that were carried forward. Also, because Maryland is experiencing severe budget problems, student aid funds may be reduced.
MASSACHUSETTS	FY 1993 funding for our largest grant program increased by nearly $10 million. This additional funding allowed us to increase the number of students who received awards and the amount of awards. FY 1993 also provided for the expansion of student loans through the No Interest Loan Program, and a new loan for middle-income students called the Massachusetts Plan Program.
MISSOURI	Currently, we are able to provide funds to only one-quarter of all eligible applicants.
NEVADA	The Nevada Student Incentive Grant Program is the only student aid program administered by the state. Since 1988, the state's Guaranteed Student Loan Program has been administered by the Arizona Educational Loan Program.
NEW JERSEY	Applications for need-based Tuition Aid Grants increased by 18 percent in 1992-93. Over the last two years, applications have increased by 50 percent. Despite increased program appropriations, award values were reduced by $80 per student in order to meet the higher demand.
NEW YORK	Because of the state's continuing fiscal crisis, reductions to awards enacted in 1991-92 continued for 1992-93. A planned increase in awards for first-time recipients in 1992-93 was also reduced. Scholarship and fellowship programs for students entering the teaching profession in shortage fields were eliminated. However, total program costs rose by 10 percent, due to increased TAP awards for first-time recipients.
PENNSYLVANIA	The program continues to receive strong support from the Governor and General Assembly, which provided a 10 percent increase in funding for 1992-93.

RHODE ISLAND	Our program is not an entitlement. Therefore, our budget appropriation may not be large enough to provide awards to all eligible students.
SOUTH CAROLINA	Because of state budget difficulties, grant funds were reduced by $1.2 million in 1991-92. All grants had to be reduced by 5 percent. Although $334,692 of the reduction was restored for 1992-93, $200,000 was non-recurring (one-time only) dollars. Since passage of the 1992-93 budget, a projected shortfall has resulted in a $122,044 reduction in the funding level.
TEXAS	No significant changes from last year.
UTAH	$134,400 in additional state funding was appropriated in 1992-93 to provide for increased matching requirements in the SSIG, SEOG, and College Work-Study Programs. Although other requests were made, the Legislature provided no other increases in funding for student aid programs.
VERMONT	VSAC is a comprehensive agency that provides career counseling and financial aid information to middle schools, high schools, and adult students. VSAC also operates the state grant programs for full-time, part-time, and non-degree students, serves as a loan guarantor for Vermont students and institutions, and provides loan capital through the Education Loan Financing Program.
WASHINGTON	As a result of a year-long debate on the distribution of grant dollars between the public and private sectors, the Higher Education Coordinating Board acted to reduce the amount of grants to private institutions. The Board reduced the amount of private colleges' cost of attendance used in calculating cost-sensitive awards to students eligible for State Need Grants.
WEST VIRGINIA	Once again, there was no increase in funding for grants. Thus, fewer students received awards. This has occurred every year since 1986-87. Unless there is a major increase in state funding or a reduction in the size of awards, this trend will continue.
WISCONSIN	Because the state budget is not finalized until late June of every other year, we must determine award allocations based on anticipated appropriations. Thus, award amounts may have to be adjusted after they are offered to students. Our appropriation is not large enough to provide awards to all eligible applicants.

PUERTO RICO	The Council on Higher Education provides state grant funds to public and private universities, based on their full-time equivalent enrollment. The institutions, in turn, determine which students receive awards. The institutions also perform all record-keeping functions and submit performance reports. The Council on Higher Education requires annual audits to ensure that funds are used in compliance with the laws and regulations.

TABLE 12

COMMENTS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN CURRENT PROGRAMS
OR OPERATIONS PLANNED FOR 1993-94 AWARD YEAR

ALABAMA	We will probably revise the Alabama Student Assistance Program (ASAP) distribution formula so that graduate school enrollment is eliminated from the institutional award calculation.
COLORADO	We have made the Colorado Nursing Grant a campus-based program, leaving the Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship as the only program whose recipients are chosen directly by our agency.
FLORIDA	Legislation was passed in 1992 to consolidate some of the current programs in 1993. This should simplify the student application and awards process.
ILLINOIS	Increased application volume, combined with higher college costs and the new federal need analysis methodology, will put tremendous financial pressure on the MAP Program. Additional rationing mechanisms and higher eligibility requirements will be necessary to target limited grant funds to the most needy students.
INDIANA	Only those changes needed to comply with the federal Reauthorization.
IOWA	State funding continues to be very tight. The new federal need analysis methodology will place added stress on the limited state funds. This may mean that some grant renewal applicants will not receive awards due to the higher need of the applicants.
KENTUCKY	The application process will change due to the new federal need analysis provisions. We want to ensure that the neediest students receive our limited grant funds.
LOUISIANA	Rather than contracting with one MDE processor to produce a combined state and federal aid application for 1993-94, Louisiana will use extractions of information from the federal processor for any federal student aid applications and generate state questions to be answered by an automated voice-response system.
MASSACHUSETTS	We hope to continue to restore funding to our grant program. We also anticipate that we will need to change our award schedule and methodology to conform to the new federal need analysis guidelines.

MICHIGAN	Applicants for the Competitive Scholarship and the Tuition Grant Programs will use the Free Application for Federal Student Aid. The ACT or CSS application will not be required.
MINNESOTA	Beginning in the 1992-93 academic year, the state grant definition of a full-time student will change from 12 credits per term to 15. In 1993-94, part-time grants will be eliminated, and state grants will cover 3 or more credits per term. A separate state aid application will be added to the FAFSA. The formula used to determine financial eligibility may also change due to the new federal need analysis requirements.
MISSISSIPPI	We will participate in the SREB Minority Doctoral Fellowship Program on a limited basis ($50,000 for 5 students) and will accelerate teacher education programs.
MISSOURI	The Missouri Higher Education Academic Scholarship Program statute may be amended to include students without a high school diploma.
NEW JERSEY	We are beginning an analysis of the effect of the changes in the federal need analysis and delivery system. Changes in the state's need analysis methodology will be made to conform to the federal guidelines. We are also analyzing the effects of the reductions in the number and types of data elements reported on the federal aid application.
NEW YORK	Due to the current economic situation, it is unclear what will occur in 1993-94. If the state and national economies improve, some program cuts may be restored. However, if there is no improvement, the cuts may continue, or additional cuts will be made.
NORTH CAROLINA	We will attempt to adjust to federal delivery mandates without disrupting our present system or distorting the purposes of our programs.
NORTH DAKOTA	No changes are currently planned. However, our State Grant Advisory Board will be reviewing our awarding process (i.e., how we calculate need; the "fair" percentage of grant dollars to public vs. private schools; setting priority deadline dates; and the number of days students should have to respond to award letters).
OHIO	The Ohio Financial Aid Study Commission has proposed that, in either 1993 or 1994, all programs currently administered by the Board of Regents be transferred to the Ohio Loan Commission, which would be reconstituted as the Ohio Student Financial Aid Commission. Legislative action is expected in either late 1992 or by June 30, 1993.

OREGON	Because of falling state revenues, the Governor has directed all state agencies to reduce their expenditures by 30 percent in their 1993-95 biennial budget requests. If our request is confirmed by the Governor and Legislature, all programs will be eliminated except the Oregon Need Grants, which would be reduced by 6 percent.
PENNSYLVANIA	Staff is currently assessing the effects of delivery system changes mandated by Reauthorization on the application process and overall state grant operations.
RHODE ISLAND	Due to changes made in the layout of the financial aid applications (separate free forms and supplemental forms), we are considering using the free federal form and eliminating the supplemental information and fee charged to students.
SOUTH CAROLINA	Due to decreases in program appropriations and increases in college costs over the past several years, the number of eligible students who did not receive awards increased to over 2,400 in 1992-93. Because of this trend, the South Carolina Tuition Grants Commission has decided to use available program dollars to fund all eligible applicants applying through June 30, 1993, for the 1993-94 award year. Since no new funding is expected, and an additional 2,500 to 3,000 awards will be made, the size of current year awards will be reduced by 25 percent to implement this change.
TENNESSEE	Because Reauthorization created a new application for the state grant programs, we will make several major modifications to our computer systems.
UTAH	We are requesting an additional $700,000 for the 1993-94 academic year to cover the increased matching requirements of the SSIG, SEOG, and CWS Programs.
VERMONT	There are no significant changes planned, although the state's continuing fiscal problems will most likely result in reduced funding.
VIRGINIA	We will consolidate the Virginia Department of Education's financial aid programs with the Council's.
WASHINGTON	The agency is considering changes in the need analysis methodology used to determine award eligibility for State Need Grants. The changes would require that eligible students be identified through an income look-up chart, rather than a recalculation through the federal methodology.
WEST VIRGINIA	We may begin to assess potential changes in the way awards are distributed. Any changes in need analysis formula could begin in 1993-94. We may also assess changes in the financial aid applications.

WISCONSIN	Because of increased fiscal constraints, all agencies are limited to a 2.5 percent increase in spending during the 1993-95 biennium. Therefore, appropriations for all state student aid programs are restricted to a 2.5 percent increase.

TABLE 13

COMMENTS REGARDING NEW STUDENT AID PROGRAMS
AND PRACTICES FOR 1993-94 OR 1994-95

DELAWARE	The Guaranteed Tuition Plan for low- and moderate-income students.
KANSAS	We will propose to the Legislature a Regents Supplemental Grant for needy students attending Regents schools. The maximum award would be 50 percent of tuition and fees. Eligible students would have to be enrolled full-time. We anticipate providing awards to 25 percent of eligible applicants.
LOUISIANA	No new programs are planned, but new programs may be introduced during the legislative session. The agency's budget request includes funds for programs which were enacted but never received appropriations.
MARYLAND	The Health Manpower Incentive Grant and the Math/Science Student Corps were enacted in 1991. However, due to budget constraints, funds for these programs were cut. The programs will be implemented as soon as they are funded.
MASSACHUSETTS	In FY 1993, two new loan programs were implemented: the No Interest Loan and the Massachusetts Plan Loan. Also in 1993, we began partial funding of the Need-Based Waiver Program, through the Cash Grant Program. We anticipate continued funding of these programs, at least at the $10 million level.
MISSOURI	We may institute five new programs: the Competitive Scholarship Program, for part-time students employed 20 hours/week; the Artistic Scholarship Program, for students demonstrating talents in the fine arts and theatre arts; Graduate Student Scholarships, based on students' GRE scores; Minority Teachers Scholarships, to recruit minorities into the teaching profession; and the Vietnam Veterans Scholarships, for survivors of veterans of the Vietnam War.
NEW YORK	The implementation of the Liberty Scholarship Program, scheduled for 1991-92, was again deferred for the 1992-93 school year. The enactment of the Federal National Early Intervention Scholarship and Partnership Program may make federal funds available for similar programs. If so, Liberty Scholarships may be implemented in 1994-95.
OHIO	During the 1993 budget session, the agency will recommend to the Ohio Assembly the enactment of a student aid program for part-time students.

RHODE ISLAND	The Family Education Loan (FEL) Program has been designed to offer lower-interest loans to middle-income families who may not be eligible for need-based loans. The credit requirements for FELs is similar to those used for loans at private banks or other lending institutions. The maximum loan amount is $15,000 per year for four years, at 8.5 percent interest. Repayment begins 60 days after the loans are disbursed.
SOUTH CAROLINA	Two new programs are being discussed: the State Grant Program for Public College Students, which would provide grants to students attending public colleges; and the College Savings Plan, which was initially structured as a guaranteed tuition program similar to Michigan's, but has since been watered down by taking away the state's liability. These two programs are being debated in the State Legislature.
TENNESSEE	Recently, the State Legislature enacted a Taylor Plan, similar to Louisiana's Taylor Plan. However, the program has not received appropriations from the Legislature.
TEXAS	The state has two grant programs enacted by the Legislature, but never funded. If funding is made available in the next legislative session, the programs could be operating in 1993. Economic circumstances, however, make it unlikely funds will be provided.
VIRGINIA	In 1994-95, we plan to start the Virginia Guaranteed Assistance Program--Virginia's Taylor Plan--which is designed to aid students in K-12 who have financial need and who meet other social and academic criteria.
WEST VIRGINIA	The Health Sciences Scholarship Program (HSSP), created last year, would award tuition and fees for college students majoring in health-related fields. Students would have to agree to serve in medically underserved areas of West Virginia in order to receive funding. The program, which is not yet in operation, received an appropriation of $150,000 in 1991-92 and 1992-93.

TABLE 14

AGENCY COMMENTS ON THE EFFECT OF THE RECESSION
ON GRANT PROGRAMS' COSTS AND NUMBER OF APPLICANTS

ALABAMA	Because of our decentralized system, we cannot report the changes in the number of grant applicants due to the recession. Average SSIGP awards will probably be higher this year, due to mid-year tuition increases at most public institutions.
ALASKA	At the state universities, applications for aid have increased dramatically, but funding has not grown. There have been fewer aid dollars available for more needy students.
CALIFORNIA	In the last two years, the number of applications for aid has increased by 40,000. Since the number of awards is limited by state statute, the recession has not had a significant effect on program costs.
CONNECTICUT	Due to the recession, a greater percentage of students are applying for aid.
DELAWARE	We have experienced only a 2 percent increase in applications and no significant increase in program costs.
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	Since the recession, the number of applications and recipients has increased. We reduced the maximum award in order to allow more students to receive grants. The number of late awards also increased because more initial recipients chose not to enroll at their institutions.
FLORIDA	The number of eligible applicants has increased significantly. Consequently, student awards have been reduced.
IDAHO	Thus far, the recession has slowed the rate of growth of our program.
ILLINOIS	Due to the recession, the MAP Program experienced its largest number of applications ever in FY 1992, and FY 1993 applications are 7 to 8 percent higher than the FY 1992 levels. The recession has also adversely affected the state fiscal condition. As a result, funding for higher education has dropped, while tuition at state universities rose by 14.2 percent. Increased college costs and application volume has led to the earliest suspension of applications since the early 1980s.
INDIANA	The number of applicants has increased, but the proportion of applicants who received awards has fallen.

IOWA	State revenue has been relatively flat the last two fiscal years. At the same time, demand for grant dollars at two-year public colleges has risen. Program appropriations have been unable to meet this increased demand for aid.
KANSAS	We have had more applicants and a modest growth in programs.
KENTUCKY	No significant increase in program costs or applications. As of August 27, 1992, the number of applicants for 1992-93 awards was only 35 more than the number of applicants at the same time last year.
MARYLAND	Applications for 1992-93 increased by 29 percent. General State Scholarships funding increased by 13.5 percent, but the number of eligible students who did not receive awards increased by 49 percent. The average scholarship award rose by 9 percent.
MASSACHUSETTS	In recent years, the number of grant applicants has increased significantly. However, state budget constraints in FY 1992 led to a decrease in the number of awards and award values. In FY 1993, grant funding increased by $10 million, which allowed 5,000 more students to receive awards and the average award to rise by $250. More students received their maximum eligible award.
MICHIGAN	Severe budget constraints have affected administrative funds, but award funds have not decreased. The maximum award for the Tuition Grant Program has fallen in each of the last three years, while the maximum Competitive Scholarship Grant has not been increased in 15 years.
MINNESOTA	Applications have increased each year, but the average award has remained in the $1,200 to $1,500 range.
MISSISSIPPI	There have been no significant changes.
MONTANA	Due to the recession, tuition has increased at colleges and universities in the state.
NEVADA	We have not seen any adverse effect of the recession on awards during the 1992-93 academic year. In fact, our federal SSIG allocation increased from $173,171 in 1991-92 to $196,292 this year. Our administrative expenses have increased, but these are paid from the federal allocation.
NEW HAMPSHIRE	The number of grant applicants has risen slightly, but program costs remained stable.

NEW JERSEY	The recession has resulted in a 50 percent increase in the number of Tuition Aid Grant applicants during the last two years. For 1992-93, earlier deadlines were established for renewal applicants, and non-renewal students were limited to spring only awards. Award values were reduced by $80 per student from their FY 1992 levels.
NEW YORK	We believe that the current economic recession has significantly affected the number of applicants and program costs. We have also noticed an increased "persistence rate"--probably reflecting that students are staying enrolled longer and fewer students losing grant eligibility through income escalation.
NORTH CAROLINA	Grant program funding has either been reduced or remained static. We see no significant increase in funding for 1993-94 or 1994-95.
OHIO	We are experiencing a significant rise in the number of applications: 6 percent over 1991-92, and 26 percent over 1990-91. The number of awards has risen by 30 percent since 1990-91, and the amount of program dollars has grown by 21 percent. We expect the increases to drop slightly by the application deadline.
OKLAHOMA	The number of applications has risen significantly. However, part of the increase is due to the fact that we began to accept the free federal application form data in 1991-92.
OREGON	Grant applicants have increased by 12 percent. The recession has probably played a role in this increase.
PENNSYLVANIA	Applications overall continue to increase each year, with the downsizing of the military resulting in the increase of applications from students who are military veterans. Because family incomes are not keeping pace with college costs, State Grant funds are increasingly needed to help cover college costs.
RHODE ISLAND	The recession has caused higher unemployment among our applicants (and their parents, for dependent applicants). Thus, we have seen an increase in the number of applicants and in students' financial need. The number of award recipients increased by 25 percent from 1991-92 to 1992-93, but the average award fell from $850 to $690, since our appropriation could not meet the increased demand for aid.
SOUTH CAROLINA	The recession has definitely affected the program's administrative costs. Budget cuts, along with increased program costs, aid applicants, and eligible students, have made us do more with less.

TENNESSEE	Since 1990-91, the number of applicants has increased by 40 percent.
TEXAS	The recession has had no significant effect on program costs or office procedures. There may have been an increase in the number of applicants, but we do not have these data.
UTAH	Due primarily to substantial increase in college enrollments, the number of aid applicants has increased.
VERMONT	During the last two years, we have had a 28 percent increase in the number of applications. However, during the same time period, the amount of state funding has fallen by 55 percent. As a result, more students are receiving smaller grants to cover higher costs of education, and loan indebtedness is rising.
VIRGINIA	The number of applications and students' demonstrated financial need are significantly higher.
WASHINGTON	Many postsecondary institutions report dramatic increases in the number of aid applicants.
WEST VIRGINIA	Because program funding has not kept pace with increased demand and college costs, the number of students who receive awards has declined. Without an increase in funding, this trend will probably continue.
WISCONSIN	The economic recession has not had a significant effect on the grant program, other than to impose limited levels of funding increases. The number of applicants has increased moderately.

TABLE 15

COMMENTS REGARDING AGENCY'S EFFORTS TO ALLEVIATE
THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF TUITION INCREASES

ALABAMA	The negative effects of mid-year tuition increases on student aid recipients were publicized by the Commission on Higher Education.
CALIFORNIA	Some of the revenue from fee increases has been set aside for providing additional financial aid at public colleges. However, the amount set aside was not enough to cover all recipients, and no money was provided to cover Cal Grant (statewide grant) recipients.
COLORADO	If tuition at any state university campus rises by a rate higher than the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI), 16.5 percent of the additional marginal revenue must be used for institution-based financial aid.
CONNECTICUT	When tuition increases, we request additional state appropriations for financial aid for grant recipients who attend public colleges.
FLORIDA	The state increased appropriations to state universities from lottery funds to help offset tuition increases for students who demonstrate financial need.
GEORGIA	The Tuition Equalization Grant award was increased from $794 to $1,000. The Student Incentive Grant average award increased from $439 to $471 (7 percent).
ILLINOIS	In FY 1993, Illinois public universities received no new General Revenue funding. In fact, their funding was reduced by an amount equal to 28 percent of the additional revenue generated by an average 14.2 percent increase in tuition and fees. This General Revenue funding was then reallocated to the MAP Program to cover the cost of tuition and fee increases for grant recipients.
IOWA	Grant recipients affected by tuition increases are provided small amounts of additional institution-based grants, but loan debt has also increased.
KENTUCKY	CAP Grant amounts are increased to an amount equal to the community college tuition. By choosing a community college, financially-needy students who apply for a grant while funds are available can attend college tuition free.
MARYLAND	General State Scholarships are tied to tuition costs. Increases in tuition cause increases in award amounts to students.

MASSACHUSETTS	Total funding for our Cash Grant Program and Need-Based Tuition Waiver Program (exclusively for public colleges and university students) was increased by 4 percent, the amount of tuition increases at our public colleges and universities in FY 1993.
MINNESOTA	The cost of attendance used in the state grant formula reflects increased tuition. Thus, grant awards increase whenever tuition increases.
MISSOURI	We have requested additional state funding for awards and for increasing the maximum grant.
MONTANA	The Legislature did not include student financial aid in the budget recision order.
NEW JERSEY	A Tuition Stabilization Incentive Grant Program--which would provide additional funds to public institutions that do not raise tuition by more than 4.5 percent over FY 1992 levels--was approved by the Legislature.
NEW MEXICO	We request state funding increases that are at least as large as the increases in tuition.
NEW YORK	TAP awards cover all tuition, minus $75, at public institutions for students with adjusted gross incomes under $19,000. Tuition increases at public institutions will be covered for all students who receive TAP awards greater than the minimum. Thus, for low-income students, TAP awards negate the effects of rising tuition.
NORTH CAROLINA	Whenever the General Assembly imposes an increase in in-state tuition at public colleges, a portion of the expected revenue generated by the increase is set aside to expand the Appropriated Grants line item in each four-year public college budget. This is not done for increases in out-of-state tuition.
NORTH DAKOTA	North Dakota has not increased tuition at our state institutions for the last three years, nor does our 1993-95 biennial budget request call for a tuition increase. However, because of a projected shortfall in revenue, the Governor has asked all state agencies to reduce their spending by 10 percent. Keeping this request in mind, we do not know if tuition can be held at present levels.
OHIO	The state of Ohio has enacted a 9.5 percent tuition increase cap for all public institutions for the 1992-93 academic year.
OKLAHOMA	State grant awards automatically increase whenever tuition increases.

OREGON	Partially in response to increases in tuition, the Oregon State Scholarship Commission authorized a 3 percent increase in individual awards for 1992-93. Additionally, state colleges and universities have been authorized to set aside 25 percent of the additional funds collected from tuition increases for need-based aid.
PENNSYLVANIA	The State Grant Program considers all tuition increases, including those at public institutions, received prior to processing grant awards.
RHODE ISLAND	No mechanisms have been put into place to address directly the effects of tuition increases at public institutions. However, due to increases in tuition at all institutional types, an increase in eligible students, and falling program appropriations, the maximum award was lowered from $1,200 to $800 for renewal applications (remained at $800 for first-time recipients) and out-of-state tuition was capped at in-state tuition levels for first-time applicants.
TENNESSEE	For 1992-93, the state provided enough grant funding to cover the cost of a 7 percent increase in tuition at public institutions.
TEXAS	Institutions are required to set aside 15 percent of tuition revenues for resident need-based grants, and 3 percent of out-of-state tuition revenues for non-resident awards.
VERMONT	There are no mechanisms that link student aid to tuition increases. For FY 1993, all of higher education, including student aid, received across-the-board reductions in funding.
VIRGINIA	There was an increase of $11 million in funding for discretionary aid programs, which helped offset a $38 million increase in tuition for needy students. Over two-thirds of the tuition increase for needy students was covered by the increased aid.
WASHINGTON	It is expected that centrally-administered student financial aid appropriations be increased by an amount equal to 24 percent of any additional revenue that results from tuition and fee increases.
WEST VIRGINIA	Since 1981-82, a portion of the revenue collected from student fees in public colleges has been allocated to the State Grant Program to assist needy students. Presently, the program receives $1.8 million to offset tuition increases. In the past year, a similar plan has been mandated for institutions in the state university system.
WISCONSIN	Tuition increases in the public sector have been limited to proposed legislative funding increases.
PUERTO RICO	None. We have had to reduce the average grant award.

TABLE 16

COMMENTS REGARDING THE EFFECTS OF CHANGES IN AGENCY GRANT PROGRAMS ON COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS

ALASKA	State funding for grants at state universities has not increased for the past several years. This means that the available funding goes for less each year, as tuition and fees increase. This has affected our ability to recruit and retain students.
FLORIDA	College enrollments have increased; no enrollment caps have been set in Florida.
ILLINOIS	Overall, higher education enrollment is up in Illinois. Therefore, funding levels do not appear to have had an effect on enrollments. However, at least one public institution is limiting enrollment to maintain quality with available funding.
MARYLAND	Higher education has experienced major budget cuts, which have affected tuition levels and caused shifts in enrollment. As tuitions have increased and enrollment patterns changed, the distribution of scholarship funds has shifted among the institutional types.
MINNESOTA	The new requirement that students take 15 or more credits to be considered full-time may encourage students to finish in four years. It is too early to tell the effects of this requirement on enrollments.
SOUTH CAROLINA	Because the funding levels of South Carolina Tuition Grants has remained the same while college costs have increased by 7 percent annually for the past three years, the number of eligible grant applicants who received no grant aid has risen each year. The number of unfunded grant-eligible students for 1992-93 is 2,400. Since the enrollment rate for unfunded students is 50 percent, compared to 80 percent for funded students, it is most likely that college enrollments have been limited.

TABLE 17

AGENCY COMMENTS ON THE POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF THE NEW FEDERAL NEED ANALYSIS RULES ON THE NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF GRANT AWARDS

ALABAMA	Because we use a decentralized system to determine financial need, we cannot predict the effects of the new federal need analysis rules.
ALASKA	Need is determined by each of the institutions in the Statewide System of Higher Education. The Anchorage and Juneau campuses of the University of Alaska will continue to use the CM, while the Fairbanks Campus will use other methods.
ARIZONA	We will continue to use the CM. We do not expect the new federal need analysis rules to have an effect on our program administration. However, we may have to make fewer awards or decrease the size of awards.
ARKANSAS	We will continue to use the CM. If need increases and more students qualify for aid, the total number of awards will be reduced. There probably will not be any targeting or rationing of awards, but that is not decided at this time.
CALIFORNIA	We will use the new federal CM without any modifications, as required by state law. The number of awards is capped by state law, so although more students will be eligible, the number of awards will not increase very much. Thus, the number of students who will be denied awards will increase. The Commission is examining possible options to mitigate any shifts in award recipients.
COLORADO	Because our programs are campus-based, there will be no direct effect on our operations.
CONNECTICUT	The new federal methodology may require that we use only data supplied by the federal contractor, which may compromise the integrity of our small, centrally-administered program.
DELAWARE	We plan to use the CM. Since we presently fund the maximum number of awards provided by state law, the number of awards probably will not change. The characteristics of students who receive grants may be affected.
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	We will continue to use the CM. We do not anticipate any significant changes in the number of awards or the rationing of awards.
FLORIDA	We will use the new federal methodology. This may cause us to make fewer awards. If so, we will target funds to the students with the lowest family contribution.

GEORGIA	We will continue to use the CM. We predict that fewer students will receive Incentive Gants, but the average award will rise.
IDAHO	Our office does not make need determinations.
ILLINOIS	The new federal methodology will increase eligibility for MAP awards. ISAC will continue to use a modified version of the CM and will need to apply additional rationing mechanisms. At this time, it is unclear what actions we will take (either make smaller awards to more students or larger awards to fewer students). Ultimately, grant dollars will be targeted towards the neediest students.
INDIANA	We will use the new federal methodology.
IOWA	Preliminary analysis of the new CM indicates that the average family contribution will fall by 32 percent. We will use the new CM in 1993-94, but recognize that the lower FCs will make more students eligible for assistance. We have requested additional state funding, but also may lower FC award levels.
KANSAS	We will continue to use the CM for the time being. However, we anticipate that the new federal methodology will increase the number of eligible students and award amounts. We will have to lower the number of awards to students due to these changes.
KENTUCKY	No decisions have been made, but most likely we will continue to use the CM. We will either rank CAP Grant applicants in ascending order by FC and make awards until funds are exhausted, or lower the FC to $2,000 (from $3,000) for all applicants. We want to target limited funds to the most needy students. Since our CAP Grant award is a fixed amount, the number of awards is governed by the appropriations, not the increased need of students.
LOUISIANA	There will be no significant effect of using the new CM on our scholarship and grant programs. However, our loan division and colleges and universities may be affected.
MAINE	Currently, we are preparing computer simulations to find out what effect the changes in the new CM will have. Then, we will prepare a new need analysis system to address the needs of Maine students more equitably.
MARYLAND	Maryland intends to use the new CM, but must adjust its current aid packaging policies to avoid major decreases in the number of scholarship recipients. We will seek to maintain the same number of students and average award amounts.

MASSACHUSETTS	We will probably use the new CM without modifications. This change will require a major revision of the award schedule, due to the increased number of eligible applicants. However, every effort will be made to protect current recipients with graduated awards.
MICHIGAN	Michigan will use the new federal methodology as an initial award criterion. We have not yet determined other options. For the last 12 years, we have increased the FC by 25 percent.
MINNESOTA	We anticipate that the new need analysis will result in greater need for more students. A surcharge on student's and/or parents' contribution may have to be added if there is a funding shortfall (as required by state statute).
MISSOURI	We will continue to use the CM. We do not expect to have to target awards differently, or to make other significant changes, since we do not have enough funding to award all eligible students.
MONTANA	We will use the new federal CM. We expect the demand for awards to rise.
NEBRASKA	We will continue to use our own formula to determine allocations of grant funds to postsecondary institutions. Each institution determines the number and amount of grant awards from its allocation.
NEVADA	Need is determined by each postsecondary institution.
NEW HAMPSHIRE	We will continue to use the CM. Undoubtedly, we will have to make fewer awards, and will have to target awards differently.
NEW JERSEY	Currently, we are analyzing the effects of the new federal methodology. We may modify the federal methodology and ration awards differently.
NEW YORK	Our operating state grant programs are independent of federal programs and do not use the federal need analysis. The Liberty Scholarship Program, however, does supplement the Pell Grant Program, and may be changed to reflect the new need analysis and the new federal National Early Intervention Program.
NORTH CAROLINA	At this time, we plan to continue to use the CM. The changes we will make will be based on an analysis on awards made in 1991-92 and 1992-93.
NORTH DAKOTA	Presently, we plan to continue using the CM. By state law, our SSIG award is $600, and we do not plan on changing this award amount.

OHIO	We will not be affected by the new federal need analysis. The OIG Program is centrally-administered, and award eligibility is based on a state system that reflects family income and the number of dependent children in the family. A table of grant award levels is set in the state statute.
OKLAHOMA	We use a state-specific need analysis system that is not affected by changes in the federal need analysis rules.
OREGON	At this time, we are not sure of the effects of the new CM on our programs, but we believe aggregate need will rise substantially. We have not made a decision on what our policy will be as a result of these changes.
PENNSYLVANIA	PHEAA does not use the CM to determine eligibility for State Grants. A separate Agency-developed system is used for this purpose. However, because a portion of each student's Pell Grant award reduces eligibility for State Grants, the staff expects an effect when single federal need analysis rules are applied for Pell Grant applicants. We will be able to assess this effect in 1993.
RHODE ISLAND	A formal decision has not been made. Simulations will be run with the new CM formula to determine a course of action. We assume that our students' need will increase under the new formula.
SOUTH CAROLINA	The South Carolina Tuition Grant Program will also exclude home and farm equity when determining need. This will result in more students becoming eligible for awards. However, since no increase in state funding for grant awards is expected, grants will have to be smaller in order to provide more aid for eligible students. The number of awards made in 1992-94 will not be affected, since available funds will be used to provide grants to all eligible applicants who apply on or before June 30, 1993.
TENNESSEE	Due to time constraints for system changes, the new federal need analysis will be used to determine Tennesee Student Assistance Grant awards. However, we anticipate that the maximum eligibility index of 1900, as provided in the new family contribution index, will be lowered, due to the expanded eligibility criteria.
TEXAS	We anticipate using the new CM. Individual institutions will have to decide whether to make smaller awards to an equal number of applicants, or larger awards to fewer students.
UTAH	We will continue to use the CM for SSIG awards as part of institution-based financial aid packages.
VERMONT	VSAC will continue to use a modified version of the CM to determine award eligibility.

VIRGINIA	We will use the CM or a slightly modified version of the federal need analysis methodology. This will increase students' demonstrated need, but we do not know how this will affect the number and size of awards. We may have to ration awards differently.
WASHINGTON	The proposed changes in our need analysis, described in Table 12 of this survey, were inspired by the potential effect of Reauthorization.
WEST VIRGINIA	The new federal need analysis will probably increase the number of students eligible for awards. We will continue to use the CM to determine grant eligibility. Without a substantial increase in funding, fewer students will receive awards. Alternative strategies may be considered.
WISCONSIN	The new federal need analysis will increase student eligibility and aggregate need. We will continue to use the CM, but will either make fewer awards, or will lower the amount of awards. This action will be necessary until more funds are appropriated to meet the higher need. Decisions must be made to determine the "best" way to allocate limited funds.
WYOMING	Individual postsecondary institutions determine need.
PUERTO RICO	We will continue to use the Pell Grant system to determine award eligibility.

TABLE 18

STATES WITH APPROPRIATIONS TO INSTITUTIONS
SPECIFICALLY FOR FINANCIAL AID AWARD PURPOSES
(dollar amounts in millions)

States	Appropriation Amounts	Eligible Institutions	Types of Recipients*	Types of Awards**	Need-Based?
California	$130.857	Pub 4 & 2-Yr	All	All but L	All
Colorado	35.047	Pub 4-Yr	FU, PU	TR	No
Connecticut	17.600	Pub & Pri 4 & 2-Yr	FU, PU	G & W	All
Delaware	4.711	Pub 4 & 2-Yr	FU	G, W, FM, S	Some
Dist. of Columbia	0.879	Pub 4-Yr	All	TR, G, W, FM, S	Some
Florida	16.829	Pub 4-Yr	All	All	Some
Hawaii	4.600	Pub 4 & 2-Yr	All	TR & L	Some
Iowa	27.783	Pub 4-Yr	FU, PU	G	No
Maryland	0.750	Pub & Pri 4 & 2-Yr	PU	G	All
Nebraska	2.600	Pub & Pri 4 & 2-Yr; V-T	FU, PU	TR, G, S	All
New Hampshire	0.387	Pub & Pri 4 & 2-Yr; V-T	FU	S	No
New Mexico	4.933	Pub 4-Yr, 2-Yr, V-T	FU	S	No
New York	68.278	Pub & Pri 4 & 2-Yr; V-T; Nurs	All	All but L	Some
North Carolina	36.527	Pub 4-Yr; Pri 4 & 2-Yr	All	All but L	Some
Oregon	1.251	Pri 4-Yr	FU	G	All
Texas	4.020	Pub 4-Yr	All	W, FM, S	All
Utah	1.034	Pub 4 & 2-Yr	All	TR, G, F, S	Some
Virginia	42.791	Pub 4 & 2-Yr	FU, FG	G, FM, F	Some
Washington	13.900	Pub 4 & 2-Yr	All	All	All
Puerto Rico	7.700	Pub & Pri 4 & 2-Yr	FU, FG	All but TR, L	All
Grand Total	$422.477				

* Codes for Types of Recipients

PU = Part-time undergraduates
FU = Full-time undergraduates
FG = Full-time graduate/professional school students
PG = Part-time graduate/professional school students

** Codes for Types of Awards

TR = Tuition remission
G = Grants
L = Long-term loans
W = Student employment
FM = Federal matching funds purposes
F = Graduate fellowships, assistantships
S = Scholarships

TABLE 19

AGGREGATE DOLLARS OF AWARDS FOR UNDERGRADUATE
NEED-BASED GRANT PROGRAMS, BY STATES, GROUPED BY
AWARD DOLLAR VOLUMES, 1987-88 TO 1992-93
(amounts in millions)

	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	Estimated 1992-93	Five-Year Pct Change
California	$118.819	$129.264	$153.045	$ 161.642	$ 172.852	$ 151.379	+27.4%
Illinois	135.880	143.373	171.361	183.508	184.753	203.532	+49.8
New Jersey	70.298	76.204	84.347	87.054	100.220	118.868	+69.1
New York	372.363	355.192	382.655	428.358	504.195	554.803	+49.0
Pennsylvania	110.992	118.986	132.344	142.389	158.092	173.214	+56.1
SUBTOTAL	$808.352	$823.019	$923.752	$1,002.951	$1,120.112	$1,201.796	+48.7%
PCT CHANGE	+0.6%	+1.8%	+12.2%	+8.6%	+11.7%	+7.3%	--
Connecticut	$ 14.650	$ 21.149	$ 19.915	$ 20.580	$ 20.595	$ 20.805	+ 42.0%
Florida	15.245	16.522	20.134	24.729	29.279	29.628	+ 92.1
Indiana	45.408	35.692	41.874	46.756	(50.441)	55.814	+ 22.9
Iowa	25.960	30.050	32.467	35.586	34.654	34.067	+ 31.2
Kentucky	12.161	12.522	12.605	19.866	16.996	20.520	+ 68.7
Maryland	8.737	12.841	14.800	15.607	16.253	20.828	+138.4
Massachusetts	61.600	62.443	50.844	46.000	23.690	45.989	- 25.3
Michigan	70.099	75.467	70.721	68.918	78.116	75.469	+ 7.7
Minnesota	63.300	68.293	58.136	74.656	81.322	83.170	+ 31.4
Ohio	49.200	50.865	53.848	54.600	57.275	66.000	+ 34.1
Puerto Rico	14.321	15.812	(16.812)	(16.812)	16.488	20.117	+ 40.5
Texas	22.705	22.266	24.784	24.135	27.385	27.467	+ 21.0
Washington	12.425	12.858	13.925	21.095	23.527	23.571	+ 89.7
Wisconsin	34.653	35.842	38.072	42.365	42.324	44.216	+ 27.6
SUBTOTAL	$450.464	$472.622	$468.937	$511.705	$518.345	$567.661	+ 26.0%
PCT CHANGE	+10.6%	+4.9%	-0.8%	+9.1%	+1.3%	+9.5%	--

	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	Estimated 1992-93	Five-Year Pct Change
Colorado	$ 9.327	$ 9.395	$10.349	$11.276	$12.380	$14.812	+58.8%
Missouri	8.394	10.234	10.796	11.078	10.142	11.097	+32.2
Oklahoma	10.245	9.861	11.591	11.871	12.612	13.286	+29.7
Oregon	9.959	10.108	10.092	11.809	12.023	12.606	+20.7
South Carolina	16.346	17.810	18.150	17.901	16.800	17.105	+ 4.6
Tennessee	12.591	11.977	12.977	13.487	12.793	13.723	+ 9.0
Vermont	8.414	9.264	11.137	10.184	11.019	11.120	+32.2
SUBTOTAL	$75.276	$78.649	$85.092	$87.606	$87.769	$93.749	+24.5%
PCT CHANGE	+4.4%	+4.5%	+8.2%	+3.0%	+0.2%	+6.8%	--
Arkansas	$ 3.759	$ 3.903	$ 3.946	$ 3.885	$ 4.742	$ 6.319	+ 68.1%
Kansas	5.337	5.540	6.478	6.462	6.587	6.894	+ 29.2
Louisiana	1.880	1.947	2.786	3.827	4.446	5.125	+172.6
Maine	1.418	1.408	1.877	4.802	5.002	5.200	+266.7
New Mexico	4.107	5.024	5.601	6.479	(7.293)	8.295	+102.0
Rhode Island	8.138	8.967	9.917	9.522	9.141	9.586	+ 17.8
Virginia	4.414	8.062	7.966	7.351	4.892	6.654	+ 50.7
West Virginia	5.189	5.204	5.217	5.559	5.781	5.868	+ 13.1
SUBTOTAL	$34.242	$40.055	$43.788	$47.887	$47.884	$53.941	+ 57.5%
PCT CHANGE	+7.3%	+17.0%	+9.3%	+9.4%	0.0%	+12.6%	--

	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	Estimated 1992-93	Five-Year Pct Change
Alabama	$ 2.260	$ 2.196	$ 2.984	$ 2.878	$ 2.183	$ 2.271	+ 0.5%
Arizona	3.222	3.508	3.420	3.318	2.278	2.437	- 24.4
Delaware	0.807	0.829	0.956	1.066	0.906	1.121	+ 38.9
Dist. of Columbia	1.106	1.075	1.069	0.947	0.978	1.015	- 8.2
Georgia	4.599	5.197	4.607	5.070	5.084	4.951	+ 7.7
Mississippi	1.230	1.251	1.243	1.136	1.131	1.244	+ 1.1
Nebraska	1.094	1.052	1.276	2.192	2.370	2.613	+138.8
New Hampshire	0.810	0.886	0.918	0.770	0.825	1.253	+ 54.7
North Carolina	4.559	4.489	3.046	2.519	2.908	3.163	- 30.6
North Dakota	0.490	0.976	1.242	1.177	1.475	2.162	+341.2
Utah	1.133	1.081	1.091	1.001	1.034	1.115	- 1.6
SUBTOTAL	$21.310	$22.540	$21.852	$22.074	$21.172	$23.345	+ 9.5%
PCT CHANGE	+4.7%	+5.8%	-3.1%	+1.0%	-4.1%	+10.3%	--
Alaska	$0.240	$0.234	$0.228	$0.464	$0.475	$0.470	+95.8%
Hawaii	0.563	0.598	0.726	0.612	0.632	0.724	+28.6
Idaho	0.343	0.348	0.346	0.350	0.483	0.580	+69.1
Montana	0.419	0.420	0.415	0.383	0.414	0.418	- 0.2
Nevada	0.352	0.352	(0.352)	0.321	0.326	0.341	- 3.1
South Dakota	0.516	0.506	0.504	0.468	0.480	0.587	+13.8
Wyoming	0.240	0.212	(0.241)	(0.212)	0.216	0.225	- 6.3
SUBTOTAL	$2.673	$2.670	$2.812	$2.810	$3.026	$3.345	+25.1%
PCT CHANGE	-4.7%	-0.1%	+5.3%	-0.1%	+7.7%	+10.5%	--
GRAND TOTAL	$1,392.317	$1,439.555	$1,546.233	$1,675.033	$1,798.308	$1,943.837	+39.6%
PCT CHANGE	+4.0%	+3.4%	+7.4%	+8.3%	+7.4%	+8.1%	--

Note: Numbers in parentheses are estimates from preceding year's responses.

TABLE 20

NET DOLLAR CHANGES IN UNDERGRADUATE NEED-BASED GRANT AWARDS
AND AVERAGE ANNUAL COMBINED GRANT AWARDS BY STATES,
1988-89 TO 1990-91 AND 1990-91 TO 1992-93
(amounts in millions)

	Net Dollar Change			Average Annual		
	1988-1990	1990-1992	Difference	1988-1990	1990-1992	Percent Difference
California	+$ 32.378	-$ 10.263	-$42.641	$147.984	$ 161.958	+ 9.4%
Illinois	+ 40.135	+ 20.024	- 20.111	166.081	190.598	+14.8
New Jersey	+ 10.850	+ 31.814	+ 20.964	82.535	102.047	+23.6
New York	+ 73.166	+ 126.445	+ 53.279	388.735	495.785	+27.5
Pennsylvania	+ 23.403	+ 30.825	+ 7.422	131.240	157.898	+20.3
SUBTOTAL	+$179.932	+$198.845	+$18.913	$916.575	$1,108.286	+20.9%
Connecticut	-$ 0.569	+$ 0.225	+$ 0.794	$ 20.548	$ 20.660	+ 0.5%
Florida	+ 8.207	+ 4.899	- 3.308	20.462	27.879	+36.2
Indiana	+ 11.064	+ 9.058	- 2.006	41.441	51.004	+23.1
Iowa	+ 5.536	- 1.519	- 7.055	32.701	34.769	+ 6.3
Kentucky	+ 7.344	+ 0.654	- 6.690	14.998	19.127	+27.5
Maryland	+ 2.766	+ 5.221	+ 2.455	14.416	17.563	+21.8
Massachusetts	- 16.443	- 0.011	+ 16.432	53.096	38.560	-27.4
Michigan	- 6.549	+ 6.551	+ 13.100	71.702	74.168	+ 3.4
Minnesota	+ 6.363	+ 8.514	+ 2.151	67.028	79.716	+18.9
Ohio	+ 3.735	+ 11.400	+ 7.665	53.104	59.292	+11.7
Puerto Rico	+ 1.000	+ 3.305	+ 2.305	16.479	17.806	+ 8.1
Texas	+ 1.869	+ 3.329	+ 1.460	23.728	26.329	+11.0
Washington	+ 8.237	+ 2.476	- 5.761	15.959	22.731	+42.4
Wisconsin	+ 6.523	+ 1.851	- 4.672	38.760	42.968	+10.9
SUBTOTAL	+$39.083	+$55.953	+$16.870	$484.422	$532.572	+ 9.9%

	Net Dollar Change			Average Annual		
	1988-1990	1990-1992	Difference	1988-1990	1990-1992	Percent Difference
Colorado	+$1.881	+$3.536	+$1.655	$10.340	$12.823	+24.0%
Missouri	+ 0.884	+ 0.019	- 0.865	10.703	10.772	+ 0.6
Oklahoma	+ 2.010	+ 1.415	- 0.595	11.108	12.590	+13.3
Oregon	+ 1.701	+ 0.797	- 0.904	10.670	12.146	+13.8
South Carolina	+ 0.091	- 0.796	- 0.887	17.954	17.269	- 3.8
Tennessee	+ 1.510	+ 0.236	- 1.274	12.814	13.334	+ 4.1
Vermont	+ 0.920	+ 0.936	+ 0.016	10.195	10.774	+ 5.7
SUBTOTAL	+$8.997	+$6.143	-$2.854	$83.784	$89.708	+ 7.1%
Arkansas	-$0.018	+$2.434	+$2.452	$ 3.911	$ 4.982	+27.4
Kansas	+ 0.922	+ 0.432	- 0.490	6.160	6.648	+ 7.9
Louisiana	+ 1.880	+ 1.298	- 0.582	2.853	4.466	+56.5
Maine	+ 3.394	+ 0.398	- 2.996	2.696	5.001	+85.5
New Mexico	+ 1.455	+ 1.816	+ 0.361	5.701	7.356	+29.0
Rhode Island	+ 0.555	+ 0.064	- 0.491	9.469	9.416	- 0.6
Virginia	- 0.711	- 3.156	- 2.445	7.793	6.299	-19.2
West Virginia	+ 0.355	+ 0.309	- 0.046	5.327	5.736	+ 7.7
SUBTOTAL	+$7.832	+$3.595	-$4.237	$43.910	$49.904	+13.7%

	Net Dollar Change			Average Annual		Percent
	1988-1990	1990-1992	Difference	1988-1990	1990-1992	Difference
Alabama	+$0.682	-$0.607	-$1.289	$ 2.686	$ 2.444	- 9.0%
Arizona	- 0.190	- 0.881	- 0.691	3.415	2.678	-21.6
Delaware	+ 0.237	+ 0.055	- 0.182	0.950	1.031	+ 8.5
Dist. of Columbia	- 0.128	+ 0.068	+ 0.196	1.030	0.980	- 4.9
Georgia	- 0.127	- 0.119	+ 0.008	4.958	5.035	+ 1.6
Mississippi	- 0.115	+ 0.108	+ 0.223	1.210	1.170	- 3.3
Nebraska	+ 1.140	+ 0.421	- 0.719	1.507	2.392	+58.7
New Hampshire	- 0.116	+ 0.483	+ 0.599	0.858	0.949	+10.6
North Carolina	- 1.970	+ 0.644	+ 2.614	3.351	2.863	-14.6
North Dakota	+ 0.201	+ 0.985	+ 0.784	1.132	1.605	+41.8
Utah	- 0.080	+ 0.114	+ 0.194	1.058	1.050	- 0.8
SUBTOTAL	-$0.466	+$1.271	+$1.737	$22.155	$22.197	+ 0.2%
Alaska	+$0.230	+$0.006	-$0.224	$0.309	$0.470	+52.1%
Hawaii	+ 0.014	+ 0.112	+ 0.098	0.645	0.656	+ 1.7
Idaho	+ 0.002	+ 0.230	+ 0.228	0.348	0.471	+35.3
Montana	- 0.037	+ 0.035	+ 0.072	0.406	0.405	- 0.2
Nevada	- 0.031	+ 0.020	+ 0.051	0.342	0.329	- 3.8
South Dakota	- 0.038	+ 0.119	+ 0.157	0.493	0.512	+ 3.9
Wyoming	0.000	+ 0.013	+ 0.013	0.222	0.218	- 1.8
SUBTOTAL	+$0.140	+$0.535	+$0.395	$2.765	$3.061	+10.7%
GRAND TOTAL	+$235.518	+$266.342	+$30.824	$1,553.611	$1,805.728	+16.2%

TABLE 21

ESTIMATED GRANT DOLLARS PER RESIDENT POPULATION,
1992-93, BY STATE

	State	Need-Based Aid to Undergraduates		State	All Grant Aid		State	Total 1991 Population*
1.	New York	$30.72	1.	New York	$31.98	1.	California	30,380
2.	Vermont	19.61	2.	Iowa	22.94	2.	New York	18,058
3.	Minnesota	18.77	3.	Vermont	19.90	3.	Texas	17,349
4.	Illinois	17.63	4.	Illinois	19.50	4.	Florida	13,277
5.	New Jersey	15.32	5.	Minnesota	18.77	5.	Pennsylvania	11,961
6.	Pennsylvania	14.48	6.	New Jersey	16.63	6.	Illinois	11,543
7.	Iowa	12.19	7.	Pennsylvania	14.50	7.	Ohio	10,939
8.	Indiana	9.95	8.	Oklahoma	12.76	8.	Michigan	9,368
9.	Rhode Island	9.55	9.	Connecticut	10.97	9.	New Jersey	7,760
10.	Wisconsin	8.92	10.	North Carolina	10.45	10.	North Carolina	6,737
11.	Michigan	8.06	11.	New Mexico	10.35	11.	Georgia	6,623
12.	Massachusetts	7.71		NATION	10.10	12.	Virginia	6,286
	NATION	7.63	12.	Indiana	10.02	13.	Massachusetts	5,996
13.	Connecticut	6.32	13.	Rhode Island	9.88	14.	Indiana	5,610
14.	Ohio	6.03	14.	Massachusetts	9.86	15.	Missouri	5,158
15.	Kentucky	5.53	15.	Wisconsin	9.67	16.	Washington	5,018
16.	New Mexico	5.36	16.	Michigan	8.92	17.	Wisconsin	4,955
17.	California	4.98	17.	Ohio	8.61	18.	Tennessee	4,953
18.	South Carolina	4.80	18.	West Virginia	8.27		NATION	4,945
19.	Washington	4.70	19.	California	7.83	19.	Maryland	4,860
20.	Colorado	4.39	20.	Colorado	7.80	20.	Minnesota	4,432
21.	Oregon	4.31	21.	Texas	7.56	21.	Louisiana	4,252
22.	Maryland	4.29	22.	Kentucky	7.48	22.	Alabama	4,089
23.	Maine	4.21	23.	Utah	7.09	23.	Arizona	3,750
24.	Oklahoma	4.18	24.	Florida	5.75	24.	Kentucky	3,713
25.	North Dakota	3.40	25.	Maryland	5.55	25.	South Carolina	3,560
26.	West Virginia	3.26	26.	South Carolina	5.14	26.	Colorado	3,377
27.	Tennessee	2.77	27.	Tennessee	4.94	27.	Connecticut	3,291
28.	Kansas	2.76	28.	Washington	4.90	28.	Oklahoma	3,175
29.	Arkansas	2.66	29.	Oregon	4.31	29.	Oregon	2,922
30.	Florida	2.23	30.	Alaska	4.29	30.	Iowa	2,795
31.	Missouri	2.15	31.	Virginia	4.28	31.	Mississippi	2,592
32.	Dist. of Columbia	1.70	32.	Maine	4.21	32.	Kansas	2,495
33.	Delaware	1.65	33.	Missouri	4.19	33.	Arkansas	2,372
34.	Nebraska	1.64	34.	Georgia	3.92	34.	West Virginia	1,801
35.	Texas	1.58	35.	North Dakota	3.87	35.	Utah	1,770
36.	Louisiana	1.21	36.	Alabama	3.47	36.	Nebraska	1,593
37.	New Hampshire	1.13	37.	Montana	3.23	37.	New Mexico	1,548
38.	Virginia	1.06	38.	Arkansas	3.08	38.	Nevada	1,284
39.	South Dakota	0.83	39.	Kansas	2.80	39.	Maine	1,235
40.	Alaska	0.82	40.	Delaware	2.28	40.	Hawaii	1,135
41.	Georgia	0.75	41.	Louisiana	1.80	41.	New Hampshire	1,105
42.	Arizona	0.65	42.	Dist. of Columbia	1.79	42.	Idaho	1,039
43.	Hawaii	0.64	43.	Nebraska	1.64	43.	Rhode Island	1,004
44.	Utah	0.63	44.	New Hampshire	1.46	44.	Montana	808
45.	Alabama	0.56	45.	Idaho	0.97	45.	South Dakota	703
46.	Idaho	0.56	46.	South Dakota	0.96	46.	Delaware	680
47.	Montana	0.52	47.	Arizona	0.65	47.	North Dakota	635
48.	Wyoming	0.49	48.	Hawaii	0.64	48.	Dist. of Columbia	598
49.	Mississippi	0.48	49.	Mississippi	0.52	49.	Alaska	570
50.	North Carolina	0.47	50.	Wyoming	0.48	50.	Vermont	567
51.	Nevada	0.27	51.	Nevada	0.31	51.	Wyoming	460

* Population figures are in 1,000s.

Sources of Data: Grant Aid Dollars are calculated from Column One and Column Six in Table 1 of this report. Resident population statistics are from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992 Statistical Abstract of the United States, Table 27, page 26.

TABLE 22

ESTIMATED GRANT DOLLARS PER RESIDENT COLLEGE-AGE POPULATION, 1992-93, BY STATE

	State	Need-Based Aid to Undergraduates	State	All Grant Aid	State	Estimated Population Age 18-24 in 1991*
1.	New York	$294	1. New York	$307	1. California	3,312
2.	Minnesota	192	2. Iowa	227	2. Texas	1,888
3.	Vermont	177	3. Minnesota	192	3. New York	1,884
4.	Illinois	171	4. Illinois	189	4. Pennsylvania	1,211
5.	New Jersey	159	5. Vermont	179	5. Florida	1,202
6.	Pennsylvania	143	6. New Jersey	173	6. Illinois	1,193
7.	Iowa	120	7. Pennsylvania	143	7. Ohio	1,129
8.	Indiana	92	8. Oklahoma	124	8. Michigan	994
9.	Wisconsin	87	9. Connecticut	110	9. North Carolina	776
10.	Rhode Island	83	10. New Mexico	104	10. New Jersey	747
11.	Michigan	76	NATION	97	11. Georgia	736
	NATION	73	11. Wisconsin	95	12. Virginia	704
12.	Massachusetts	69	12. Indiana	92	13. Massachusetts	669
13.	Connecticut	64	13. North Carolina	91	14. Indiana	609
14.	Ohio	58	14. Massachusetts	88	15. Tennessee	530
15.	New Mexico	54	15. Rhode Island	86	NATION	517
16.	Kentucky	51	16. Michigan	84	16. Missouri	511
17.	Washington	48	17. Ohio	83	17. Wisconsin	505
18.	California	46	18. West Virginia	80	18. Washington	489
19.	Oregon	46	19. Colorado	78	19. Maryland	487
20.	Colorado	44	20. California	72	20. Louisiana	465
21.	Maryland	43	21. Texas	70	21. Alabama	447
22.	Maine	42	22. Kentucky	69	22. Minnesota	433
23.	South Carolina	42	23. Florida	64	23. South Carolina	411
24.	Oklahoma	41	24. Utah	60	24. Kentucky	401
25.	North Dakota	32	25. Maryland	55	25. Arizona	390
26.	West Virginia	31	26. Washington	50	26. Colorado	338
27.	Kansas	27	27. Oregon	46	27. Connecticut	327
28.	Arkansas	26	28. Tennessee	46	28. Oklahoma	326
29.	Tennessee	26	29. South Carolina	45	29. Mississippi	299
30.	Florida	25	30. Alaska	44	30. Iowa	283
31.	Missouri	22	31. Maine	42	31. Oregon	273
32.	Nebraska	17	32. Missouri	42	32. Kansas	252
33.	Delaware	15	33. Virginia	38	33. Arkansas	241
34.	Texas	15	34. North Dakota	37	34. Utah	208
35.	Dist. of Columbia	13	35. Georgia	35	35. West Virginia	187
36.	Louisiana	11	36. Alabama	32	36. Nebraska	156
37.	New Hampshire	11	37. Arkansas	30	37. New Mexico	154
38.	South Dakota	9	38. Kansas	28	38. Maine	123
39.	Virginia	9	39. Delaware	21	39. Nevada	121
40.	Alaska	8	40. Nebraska	17	40. Hawaii	120
41.	Georgia	7	41. Louisiana	16	41. Rhode Island	116
42.	Arizona	6	42. Dist. of Columbia	14	42. New Hampshire	112
43.	Hawaii	6	43. New Hampshire	14	43. Idaho	103
44.	Idaho	6	44. South Dakota	10	44. Dist. of Columbia	76
45.	Montana	6	45. Idaho	10	45. Delaware	75
46.	Alabama	5	46. Arizona	6	46. Montana	72
47.	Utah	5	47. Hawaii	6	47. South Dakota	69
48.	Wyoming	5	48. Montana	6	48. North Dakota	67
49.	Mississippi	4	49. Mississippi	5	49. Vermont	63
50.	North Carolina	4	50. Wyoming	5	50. Alaska	56
51.	Nevada	3	51. Nevada	3	51. Wyoming	44

* Population figures are in 1,000s.

Sources of Data: Grant Aid Dollars are calculated from Column One and Column Six in Table 1 of this report. Resident population statistics are from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992 Statistical Abstract of the United States, Table 27, page 26.

TABLE 23

ESTIMATED GRANT DOLLARS TO UNDERGRADUATES IN 1992-93
PER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT, BY STATE

	State	Need-Based Aid to Undergraduates		State	Undergraduate Grant Aid		State	Estimated Fall 1990 Undergraduates
1.	New York	$982	1.	New York	$997	1.	California	643,429
2.	New Jersey	809	2.	New Jersey	867	2.	New York	565,171
3.	Illinois	632	3.	Illinois	696	3.	Texas	438,444
4.	Minnesota	590	4.	Minnesota	590	4.	Pennsylvania	347,645
5.	Pennsylvania	498	5.	Iowa	587	5.	Illinois	321,734
6.	Vermont	483	6.	Pennsylvania	498	6.	Ohio	297,959
7.	Indiana	332	7.	Vermont	483	7.	Michigan	261,887
8.	Iowa	313	8.	Oklahoma	427	8.	Florida	235,706
9.	Michigan	288	9.	California	366	9.	Massachusetts	220,077
10.	Connecticut	281		NATION	365	10.	North Carolina	203,899
	NATION	277	10.	New Mexico	360	11.	Virginia	179,733
11.	Wisconsin	248	11.	North Carolina	340	12.	Wisconsin	178,125
12.	California	235	12.	Indiana	334	13.	Indiana	168,009
13.	Ohio	221	13.	Connecticut	327	14.	Alabama	167,097
14.	Rhode Island	213	14.	Florida	322	15.	Missouri	148,623
15.	Massachusetts	209	15.	Ohio	314	16.	New Jersey	147,002
16.	Kentucky	195	16.	Michigan	307	17.	Georgia	144,520
17.	New Mexico	193	17.	West Virginia	283	18.	Minnesota	140,958
18.	Maryland	189	18.	Massachusetts	269	19.	Washington	137,879
19.	Washington	171	19.	Wisconsin	269	20.	Tennessee	137,705
20.	South Carolina	168	20.	Kentucky	265		NATION	136,061
21.	Maine	158	21.	Maryland	243	21.	Louisiana	122,680
22.	Oklahoma	148	22.	Texas	239	22.	Colorado	119,180
23.	Oregon	145	23.	Rhode Island	221	23.	Maryland	109,854
24.	Florida	126	24.	Colorado	203	24.	Iowa	108,593
25.	Colorado	124	25.	Georgia	180	25.	Kentucky	104,963
26.	West Virginia	111	26.	South Carolina	180	26.	South Carolina	101,626
27.	Arkansas	104	27.	Tennessee	178	27.	Arizona	99,379
28.	Tennessee	99	28.	Washington	178	28.	Oklahoma	90,235
29.	Kansas	80	29.	Maine	158	29.	Mississippi	87,384
30.	North Dakota	75	30.	Utah	155	30.	Oregon	86,720
31.	Missouri	74	31.	Missouri	145	31.	Kansas	85,912
32.	Texas	63	32.	Oregon	145	32.	Utah	75,343
33.	Delaware	49	33.	Virginia	142	33.	Connecticut	73,927
34.	Alaska	47	34.	Arkansas	120	34.	Arkansas	60,807
35.	Nebraska	47	35.	Alabama	84	35.	Nebraska	56,378
36.	Louisiana	42	36.	North Dakota	84	36.	West Virginia	52,627
37.	New Hampshire	38	37.	Kansas	81	37.	Rhode Island	45,003
38.	Virginia	37	38.	Louisiana	62	38.	New Mexico	42,816
39.	Georgia	34	39.	Delaware	58	39.	Dist. of Columbia	35,750
40.	Dist. of Columbia	28	40.	Alaska	49	40.	New Hampshire	33,393
41.	Hawaii	26	41.	New Hampshire	48	41.	Maine	32,626
42.	South Dakota	26	42.	Nebraska	46	42.	Idaho	32,384
43.	Arizona	24	43.	South Dakota	29	43.	North Dakota	29,360
44.	Nevada	19	44.	Dist. of Columbia	28	44.	Hawaii	27,870
45.	Idaho	18	45.	Hawaii	26	45.	Montana	24,366
46.	Montana	17	46.	Idaho	26	46.	Delaware	23,198
47.	North Carolina	16	47.	Arizona	24	47.	South Dakota	23,161
48.	Utah	15	48.	Nevada	19	48.	Vermont	22,848
49.	Alabama	14	49.	Montana	17	49.	Nevada	18,157
50.	Mississippi	14	50.	Mississippi	15	50.	Wyoming	16,759
51.	Wyoming	13	51.	Wyoming	13	51.	Alaska	10,204

Sources of Data: Grant Aid Dollars are from Column One, Column Three, and Column Six in Table 1 of this report. Enrollment data are calculated from the Nation Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics, 1992, Table 184. Enrollments for Fall 1991 were not available as this report went to press.

TABLE 24

STATES RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATES RECEIVING GRANT AWARDS

	State	Percent of Undergraduates Receiving Need-Based Aid
1.	Vermont	56.2%
2.	New York	52.6
3.	Minnesota	48.7
4.	New Jersey	46.0
5.	Pennsylvania	36.5
6.	Illinois	36.4
7.	Indiana	33.5
8.	Ohio	32.0
9.	Rhode Island	30.0
10.	Wisconsin	29.5
11.	Kentucky	28.0
12.	Maine	26.0
13.	Connecticut	24.9
14.	Michigan	23.3
	NATION	20.7
15.	New Mexico	20.6
16.	Arkansas	19.8
17.	Massachusetts	19.6
18.	Maryland	19.6
19.	Iowa	19.3
20.	Oregon	18.6
21.	Oklahoma	18.4
22.	Colorado	16.4
23.	Washington	14.7
24.	Florida	14.2
25.	Tennessee	14.2
26.	North Dakota	12.3
27.	California	11.4
28.	Nebraska	11.3
29.	West Virginia	9.6
30.	South Dakota	6.9
31.	Georgia	6.8
32.	Delaware	6.2
33.	South Carolina	6.2
34.	Missouri	5.7
35.	Kansas	5.4
36.	Idaho	5.1
37.	Virginia	4.9
38.	Texas	4.7
39.	New Hampshire	4.8
40.	Louisiana	4.1
41.	Alabama	3.9
42.	Wyoming	3.5
43.	Alaska	3.2
44.	Arizona	3.2
45.	Nevada	3.2
46.	Dist. of Columbia	3.1
47.	Utah	2.9
48.	Hawaii	2.5
49.	Montana	2.5
50.	Mississippi	2.3
51.	North Carolina	1.5

	State	Percent of Undergraduates Receiving Aid
1.	Vermont	56.2%
2.	New Jersey	53.4
3.	New York	53.2
4.	Minnesota	48.8
5.	Ohio	47.2
6.	Illinois	43.2
7.	Pennsylvania	36.5
8.	Indiana	33.9
9.	Wisconsin	30.4
10.	Rhode Island	30.0
11.	Florida	28.3
12.	Kentucky	28.0
13.	Colorado	26.4
14.	Maine	26.1
15.	Connecticut	24.9
	NATION	23.7
16.	Michigan	23.3
17.	Maryland	22.7
18.	Iowa	21.0
19.	New Mexico	20.6
20.	Arkansas	20.5
21.	Georgia	19.8
22.	Oklahoma	19.7
23.	Massachusetts	19.7
24.	Oregon	18.6
25.	Washington	14.7
26.	Tennessee	14.3
27.	North Carolina	12.4
28.	North Dakota	12.3
29.	Virginia	12.1
30.	California	11.4
31.	Nebraska	11.3
32.	West Virginia	9.6
33.	Missouri	9.2
34.	Alabama	8.2
35.	South Dakota	7.2
36.	Delaware	7.0
37.	Louisiana	6.3
38.	South Carolina	6.2
39.	Kansas	5.6
40.	Idaho	5.4
41.	Texas	4.9
42.	New Hampshire	4.8
43.	Wyoming	3.5
44.	Alaska	3.3
45.	Arizona	3.2
46.	Nevada	3.2
47.	Dist. of Columbia	3.1
48.	Utah	2.9
49.	Hawaii	2.6
50.	Montana	2.5
51.	Mississippi	2.4

TABLE 25

TOTAL STATE GRANTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS
FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN 1992-93
(amounts in $1,000s)

	State	Percent*		State	Grant Amounts		State	Appropriation Amounts
1.	New York	21.48%	1.	New York	$577,495	1.	California	$4,841,606
2.	Vermont	20.54	2.	California	237,880	2.	Texas	2,802,348
3.	Illinois	13.10	3.	Illinois	225,141	3.	New York	2,689,086
4.	Pennsylvania	12.48	4.	Pennsylvania	173,376	4.	Illinois	1,718,849
5.	New Jersey	10.96	5.	Texas	131,220	5.	North Carolina	1,541,926
6.	Iowa	10.65	6.	New Jersey	129,073	6.	Michigan	1,539,460
7.	Massachusetts	9.45	7.	Ohio	94,131	7.	Florida	1,415,262
8.	Minnesota	8.62	8.	Michigan	83,549	8.	Pennsylvania	1,388,920
9.	Rhode Island	8.34	9.	Minnesota	83,190	9.	Ohio	1,376,490
10.	Connecticut	7.43	10.	Florida	76,339	10.	New Jersey	1,177,880
11.	Oklahoma	7.27	11.	North Carolina	70,406	11.	Minnesota	965,288
12.	Ohio	6.84	12.	Iowa	64,109	12.	Georgia	951,726
	NATION	6.46*	13.	Massachusetts	59,115	13.	Virginia	934,776
13.	Indiana	6.28	14.	Indiana	56,191	14.	Washington	909,892
14.	Michigan	5.43		NATION	50,905**	15.	Wisconsin	902,988
15.	Florida	5.39	15.	Wisconsin	47,944	16.	Indiana	894,242
16.	Wisconsin	5.31	16.	Oklahoma	40,510	17.	Alabama	824,000
17.	West Virginia	5.23	17.	Connecticut	36,105	18.	Maryland	788,159
18.	Colorado	4.98	18.	Kentucky	27,783		NATION	787,882***
19.	California	4.91	19.	Maryland	26,960	19.	Tennessee	747,525
20.	Texas	4.68	20.	Virginia	26,879	20.	South Carolina	633,379
21.	North Carolina	4.57	21.	Colorado	26,344	21.	Massachusetts	625,380
22.	Kentucky	4.47	22.	Georgia	25,990	22.	Kentucky	621,794
23.	New Mexico	4.39	23.	Washington	24,570	23.	Louisiana	620,791
24.	Missouri	3.67	24.	Tennessee	24,471	24.	Arizona	605,267
25.	Utah	3.63	25.	Missouri	21,616	25.	Iowa	601,983
26.	Maryland	3.42	26.	South Carolina	18,315	26.	Missouri	590,483
27.	Tennessee	3.27	27.	New Mexico	16,017	27.	Oklahoma	557,532
28.	Maine	3.01	28.	West Virginia	14,894	28.	Colorado	529,158
29.	South Carolina	2.89	29.	Alabama	14,183	29.	Connecticut	486,239
30.	Virginia	2.88	30.	Oregon	12,606	30.	Oregon	485,482
31.	Georgia	2.73	31.	Utah	12,556	31.	Kansas	465,860
32.	Washington	2.70	32.	Vermont	11,281	32.	Mississippi	437,215
33.	Oregon	2.60	33.	Rhode Island	9,923	33.	Arkansas	411,827
34.	New Hampshire	2.17	34.	Louisiana	7,666	34.	New Mexico	364,896
35.	Arkansas	1.77	35.	Arkansas	7,304	35.	Nebraska	358,591
36.	Alabama	1.72	36.	Kansas	6,993	36.	Utah	345,888
37.	North Dakota	1.69	37.	Maine	5,200	37.	Hawaii	341,693
38.	Kansas	1.50	38.	Nebraska	2,613	38.	West Virginia	284,606
39.	Alaska	1.41	39.	North Dakota	2,459	39.	Nevada	207,572
40.	Delaware	1.27	40.	Alaska	2,447	40.	Idaho	192,609
41.	Louisiana	1.23	41.	Arizona	2,442	41.	Alaska	174,116
42.	Nebraska	0.73	42.	New Hampshire	1,610	42.	Maine	172,984
43.	South Dakota	0.65	43.	Delaware	1,550	43.	North Dakota	145,535
44.	Idaho	0.53	44.	Mississippi	1,351	44.	Montana	125,863
45.	Arizona	0.40	45.	Idaho	1,012	45.	Delaware	122,469
46.	Montana	0.33	46.	Hawaii	724	46.	Wyoming	122,152
47.	Mississippi	0.31	47.	South Dakota	677	47.	Rhode Island	118,911
48.	Hawaii	0.21	48.	Montana	418	48.	South Dakota	104,472
49.	Nevada	0.19	49.	Nevada	401	49.	New Hampshire	74,026
50.	Wyoming	0.18	50.	Wyoming	225	50.	Vermont	54,912

* Percentage equals total grant dollars divided by total tax funds.

** Amount equals total grant dollars divided by 50.

*** Amount equals total tax funds divided by 50.

Source of Tax Fund Data: Center for Higher Education, Illinois State University, Grapevine, November-December 1992.

SECTION VII

NASSGP OFFICERS AND DIRECTORY

1992-93 NASSGP DIRECTORY

Association Officers

President: Douglas L. Collins, Oregon

President-Elect: Charles G. Treadwell, New York

Past President: Edward M. Shannon III, South Carolina

Secretary: John Heisner, Iowa

Treasurer: William J. Lannan, Montana

Council Members: Marilyn Quinn, Delaware
Jean Maday, Michigan

Past Presidents

1966-67	Arthur S. Marmaduke (California)
1967-68	Joseph D. Boyd (Illinois)
1968-69	Ron Jursa (Michigan)
1969-70	Kenneth R. Reeher (Pennsylvania)
1970-71	Elizabeth L. Ehart (New Jersey)
1971-72	Jeffrey M. Lee (Oregon)
1972-73	Walter G. Hannahs (New York)
1973-74	Richard H. Johnston (Wisconsin)
1974-75	Ronald J. Iverson (Vermont)
1975-76	Hugh Voss (Missouri) and Stan Broadway (North Carolina)
1976-77	Stan Broadway (North Carolina)
1977-78	Haskell Rhett (New Jersey)
1978-79	Kenneth R. Reeher (Pennsylvania)
1979-80	Ron Jursa (Michigan)
1980-81	Eileen D. Dickinson (New York) and Ernest E. Smith (Florida)
1981-82	Ernest E. Smith (Florida)
1982-83	Barry M. Dorsey (Virginia)
1983-84	Gary K. Weeks (Oregon)
1984-85	H. Kenneth Shook (Maryland)
1985-86	John E. Madigan (Rhode Island)
1986-87	Debra Wiley (Colorado)
1987-88	R. Ross Erbschloe (Arizona)
1988-89	Shirley A. Ort (Washington)
1989-90	Gary D. Smith (Pennsylvania)
1990-91	Francis J. Hynes (New York)
1991-92	Edward M. Shannon III (S. Carolina)

1992-93 STATE GRANT AGENCY DIRECTORY

ALABAMA

Alabama Commission on Higher Education
One Court Square, Suite 221
Montgomery, Alabama 36104-3584
Telephone: 205-269-2700
Henry J. Hector
Executive Director
Jan B. Hilyer
Assistant Director
William H. Wall
Director of Grants and Scholarships
Tom A. Roberson
Deputy Executive Director

ALASKA

Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education
Box 110505
Juneau, Alaska 99811
Telephone: 907-465-2854
Diane Barrans
Programs Coordinator

ARIZONA

Arizona Board of Regents - Commission for Postsecondary Education
2020 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
Telephone: 602-229-2591
Dr. Ed Johnson
Executive Director
Louis R. Bustillo
Associate Director

ARKANSAS

Arkansas Department of Higher Education
114 East Capitol
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
Telephone: 501-324-9300
Phil Axelroth
Coordinator of Student Aid
Mary Beth Sudduth
Associate Director of Administration
Ellen Avers
Asst. Coordinator of Financial Aid
Tammy Smith
Asst. Coordinator of Financial Aid
Lillian Williams
Asst. Coordinator of Financial Aid

CALIFORNIA

California Student Aid Commission
North Building, Suite 500
1515 "S" Street
Sacramento, California 95814
Telephone: 916-445-0880
Samuel M. Kipp III
Executive Director
Greg Gollihur
Deputy Director of Government Relations
Becky Stilling
Deputy Director, Operations

COLORADO

Colorado Commission on Higher Education
1300 Broadway, Second Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: 303-866-2723
David A. Longanecker
Executive Director
John Ceru
Adminstrator, State Student Aid
Sharon Hart
Senior Finance Officer

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut Department of Higher Education
61 Woodland Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06105
Telephone: 203-566-2618
John J. Siegrist
Director of Student Financial Aid
Patricia A. Santoro
Assistant Director of Student Financial Aid

DELAWARE

Delaware Higher Education Commission
820 North French Street, Fourth Floor
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Telephone: 302-577-3240
Marilyn R. Baker
Associate Director
John F. Corrozi
Executive Director

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia Office of
Postsecondary Education, Research,
and Assistance (OPERA)
Suite 401
2100 Martin Luther King Jr. Ave., SE
Washington, D.C. 20020
Telephone: 202-727-3685
Sheila Drews
Acting Chief, Office of
Postsecondary Education,
Research, and Assistance
Jean Green
Acting Program Manager, State
Student Incentive Grant Program
Laurencia Henderson
Coordinator, D.C. Nurses Training
Corps and Paul Douglas Teacher
Scholarship Programs

FLORIDA

Office of Student Financial Assistance
Florida Department of Education
Florida Education Center, Suite 1344
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400
Telephone: 904-488-1034
Richard T. Lutz
Director, Office of Student
Financial Assistance
M. Elizabeth Sweeney
Administrator of State Programs,
Office of Student Financial
Assistance

GEORGIA

Georgia Student Finance Commission
2082 East Exchange Place, Suite 200
Tucker, Georgia 30084
Telephone: 404-493-5402
Stephen Dougherty
Executive Director
Robert G. McCants
Deputy Executive Director
Martha Morrison
Director, State Programs Division
William Flook
Manager, Grants and Scholarships

HAWAII

Hawaii State Postsecondary Education
Commission
2444 Dole Street, Room 209
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Telephone: 808-956-8213
Carl H. Makino
Administrative Assistant

IDAHO

Idaho State Board of Education
650 West State Street, Room 307
Boise, Idaho 83720
Telephone: 208-334-2270
William Hargrove
Public Affairs Officer
Dolores Harris
Scholarship Assistant

ILLINOIS

Illinois Student Assistance Commission
Executive Offices:
500 West Monroe Street, Third Floor
Springfield, Illinois 62704
Telephone: 217-782-6767
Larry E. Matejka
Executive Director
Sheila J. Pruden
Director, Research Planning and
Policy Analysis
Robert Clement
Director, Public Information

Illinois Student Assistance Commission
Program Operations:
106 Wilmont Road
Deerfield, Illinois 60015
Telephone: 312-948-8500
John Jennetten
Chief Program Officer
Chris Peterson
Director, Program Services
Tom Breyer
Director, Client Relations

INDIANA

State Student Assistance Commission
of Indiana
964 North Pennsylvania Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Telephone: 317-232-2350
S. Kathleen White
Scholarship, Grant and
Special Programs Director
Dennis Obergfell
Education Loan Program Director
Baron P. Hill
Executive Director
Yvonne D. Heflin
Special Programs Manager

IOWA
Iowa College Student Aid Commission
201 Jewett Building
914 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50309
Telephone: 515-281-3501
Gary W. Nichols
Executive Director
John W. Heisner
Director, Program Administration
Stuart M. Vos
Director, Finance and Claims Administration

KANSAS
Kansas Board of Regents
Capitol Tower, Suite 609
400 S.W. Eighth Street
Topeka, Kansas 66603-3911
Telephone: 913-296-3517
N. Christine Crenshaw
Director of Student Financial Aid

KENTUCKY
Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority
1050 U.S. 127 South, Suite 102
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Telephone: 502-564-7990
Roger Tharp
Director, Program Administration
Paul P. Borden
Executive Director
Edwin C. Manzer
Director, Fiscal Affairs
Joyce A. Bryan
Manager, Student Aid Programs

LOUISIANA
Office of Student Financial Assistance, Louisiana Student Financial Assistance Commission
P.O. Box 91202
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-9202
Telephone: 504-922-1011
Jack L. Guinn
Executive Director
Roger Vick
Assistant Executive Director
Winona Walker Kahao
Scholarship/Grant Director
Feltus Stewart
Loan Administration Director
Deborah F. Paul
Client Services Manager
Chole Vilas
Legal Counsel

MAINE
Financial Authority of Maine, Maine Education Assistance Division
One Weston Court
State House, Station 119
Augusta, Maine 04333
Telephone: 207-289-2183
Nancy E. Wasson
Consultant, Maine Student Incentive Scholarship Program
Mia Purcell
Director, MEAD
Helen Flanagan
Byrd and Douglas Scholarship Consultant

MARYLAND
Maryland Higher Education Commission
State Scholarship Administration
16 Francis Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
Telephone: 301-974-5370
Janice Breslin Doyle
Director
Jane C. Hickey
Associate Director

MASSACHUSETTS
Massachusetts State Scholarship Office
330 Stuart Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02116
Telephone: 617-727-9420
Elizabeth K. Fontaine
Director

MICHIGAN
Michigan Higher Education Assistance Authority
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Telephone: 517-373-3394
H. Jack Nelson
Director, Student Financial Assistance Services
Jean Maday
Director, Scholarship/Grant Programs, Student Financial Assistance Services
Antonio Flores
Director, Support Services
Student Financial Assistance Services

MINNESOTA
Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board
Capitol Square Building, Suite 400
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Telephone: 612-296-3974
Cheryl Maplethorpe
Director, Financial Aid Division
Virginia Dodds
Manager, State Grant Program

MISSISSIPPI
Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning - Student Financial Aid
3825 Ridgewood Road
Jackson, Mississippi 39211-6453
Telephone: 601-982-6570
Dottie C. Strain
Director for Student Financial Aid
Ann Hajj
Student Counselor/Office Administrator
Kay Coleman
Student Counselor
Sally Williams
Student Loan Counselor

MISSOURI
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
101 Adams Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
Telephone: 314-751-2361
Dan Peterson
Senior Associate for Student Financial Aid Programs
Karen Misjak
Director, Missouri Student Loan Program

MONTANA
Montana Univerity System - Guaranteed Student Loan Program
33 South Last Chance Gulch
Helena, Montana 59620
Telephone: 406-444-6594
William J. Lannan
Director, Guaranteed Student Loan Program

NEBRASKA
Nebraska Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education
State Capitol, Sixth Floor
P.O. Box 95005
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-5005
Telephone: 402-471-2847
Bruce Stahl
Executive Director

NEVADA
Nevada Department of Education
Capitol Complex
400 West King Street
Carson City, Nevada 89710
Telephone: 702-687-5915
Susan L. Lloyd
NSIG Program Coordinator

NEW HAMPSHIRE
New Hampshire Postsecondary Education Commission
Two Industrial Park Drive
Concord, New Hampshire 03301-8512
Telephone: 603-271-2555
James A. Busselle
Executive Director

NEW JERSEY
New Jersey Department of Higher Education, Office of Student Assistance and Information Systems
4 Quakerbridge Plaza, CN 540
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
Telephone: 609-588-3268
John F. Brugel
Assistant Chancellor, Office of Student Assistance and Information Systems
Lutz Berkner
Director, Office of Student Assistance Policy
John DeFeo
Director, Office of Student Loans
Meme Omogbai
Deputy Assistant Chancellor, Office of Student Assistance and Information Systems
Stanley Regen
Director, Office of Information Systems
Renee Saleh
Director, Office of Grants and Scholarships

NEW MEXICO
New Mexico Commission on Higher Education
1068 Cerrillos Road
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-4295
Telephone: 505-827-7383
Danny K. Earp
Deputy Director

NEW YORK
New York State Higher Education Services Corporation
99 Washington Avenue, Room 1438
Albany, New York 12255
Telephone: 518-473-0431
Cornelius J. Foley
President
Francis J. Hynes
Vice President, Grants & Scholarships

NORTH CAROLINA
North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority (NCSEAA)
P.O. Box 2688
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515-2688
Telephone: 919-549-8614
Stan C. Broadway
Executive Director
Dr. Neal Cheek
Assistant Director

NORTH DAKOTA
North Dakota University System
600 East Boulevard
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0230
Telephone: 701-224-4114
Peggy A. Wipf
Director of Financial Aid

OHIO
Ohio Board of Regents
3600 State Office Tower
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0417
Telephone: 614-466-7420
Charles W. Seward III
Director, Student Assistance
Thomas L. Rudd
Asst. Director, Student Assistance
Barbara K. Metheney
Administrator
Susan Minturn
Assistant Administrator

OKLAHOMA
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education - Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant Program
P.O. Box 3020
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73154-3020
Telephone: 405-840-8356
Shiela Joyner
Director, Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant Program
Sarah Kelley
Assistant Director, Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant Program

OREGON
Oregon State Scholarship Commission
1445 Willamette Street
Eugene, Oregon 97401
Telephone: 503-346-4166
Jeffrey M. Lee
Executive Director
Douglas L. Collins
Deputy Director
James A. Beyer
Director, Grant Programs
Thomas F. Turner
Director, Special Services

PENNSYLVANIA
Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency
660 Boas Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17102
Telephone: 717-257-2500
Jay W. Evans
President and Chief Executive Officer
Gary D. Smith
Senior Vice President, State and Federal Program Operations
Mary Beth Kelly
Vice President, Student Grants
Jerry S. Davis
Vice President, Research and Policy Analysis

RHODE ISLAND
Rhode Island Higher Education Assistance Authority
560 Jefferson Boulevard
Warwick, Rhode Island 02886
Telephone: 401-277-2050
Russell Woodward
Acting Director
Mary Ann Welch
Principal Program Analyst

SOUTH CAROLINA
South Carolina Higher Education
Tuition Grants Commission
1310 Lady Street
P.O. Box 12159
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
Telephone: 803-734-1200
Edward M. Shannon III
Executive Director
Margaret P. Shannon
Assistant Director

SOUTH DAKOTA
Department of Education and Cultural
Affairs, Office of the Secretary
700 Governors Drive
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-2291
Telephone: 605-773-3134
Roxie Thielen
Financial Aid Director
John A. Bonaiuto
Department Secretary

TENNESSEE
Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation
Parkway Towers, Suite 1950
404 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0820
Telephone: 615-741-1346
Ron Gambill
Executive Director
Karen Myers
Grant Program Administrator
Naomi Derryberry
Systems Analyst

TEXAS
Texas Higher Education Coordinating
Board
P.O. Box 12788, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711
Telephone: 512-483-6340
Mack C. Adams
Assistant Commissioner for
Student Services
Gustavo O. DeLeon
Director of Grant Programs
Jane I. Caldwell
Director of Special Programs

UTAH
Utah State Board of Regents
3 Triad Center, Suite 550
355 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180
Telephone: 801-538-5247
Chalmers Gail Norris
Assoc. Commissioner for Financial
Aid/Executive Director, Utah
Higher Education Assistance
Authority
Valorie Wood
Administrative Assistant

VERMONT
Vermont Student Assistance Corporation
P.O. Box 2000, Champlain Mill
Winooski, Vermont 05404-2601
Telephone: 802-655-9602
Donald R. Vickers
Executive Director
Steven Pullen
Director, Fiscal Affairs
Edward P. Franzeim, Jr.
Director, Grant Programs and
Financial Aid Services
Marilyn J. Cargill
Assistant Director, Grant Programs

VIRGINIA
State Council of Higher Education
for Virginia
James Monroe Building
101 North 14th Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
Telephone: 804-371-7941
Gordon K. Davies
Director
James S. Alessio
Associate Director
Stephen R. Merritt
Coordinator of Financial
Aid Programs

WASHINGTON
Washington Higher Education
Coordinating Board
917 Lakeridge Way, GV-11
Olympia, Washington 98504
Telephone: 206-753-3571
Shirley A. Ort
Deputy Director for Student
Financial Aid
Betty Fallihee
Assistant Director for Audit
and Support Services
Marty Harding
Policy Associate for Research
John Klacik
Associate Director & Grants Manager
Linda LaMar
Policy Associate for Student
Financial Aid
Brenda Howard
Program Coordinator
Terry May
Program Manager
Cindy McBeth
Program Manager
Ann McLendon
Program Manager
Kathy McVay
Program Manager
Karen Moton-Tate
Program Coordinator
Barbara Theiss
Program Manager

WEST VIRGINIA
State College and University Systems
of West Virginia
Central Office
1018 Kanawha Blvd., East, Suite 700
Charleston, West Virginia 25301
Telephone: 304-348-2101
John F. Thralls
Senior Administrator
Danial E. Crockett
Director of Student and Educational
Services
Robert E. Long
Grant Program Coordinator
Judith L. Kee
Grant Program Administrator
Diana P. Wood
Scholarship Program Coordinator

WISCONSIN
Higher Educational Aids Board
P.O. Box 7885
Madison, Wisconsin 53707
Telephone: 608-267-2206
Valorie T. Olson
Executive Secretary
Donovan K. Fowler
Administrator, Program and Policy

WYOMING
Wyoming Community College Commission
Herschler Building, Second West
122 West 25th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
Telephone: 307-777-7763
Carol Boam-Smith
Dean, Educational Policy

PUERTO RICO
Council on Higher Education
Box 23305, U.P.R. Station
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00931
Telephone: 809-758-3350
Ismael Ramirez Soto
Executive Director